INDEX TO VOLUME XXXVI

PAGE

American Christians and the War 81

The Biblical Basis of Law 276

Book Reviews 58, 137, 317

- The Christian Basis of a New Society 59
- The Christian Faith and Contemporary Culture . 317
- Conditions of Peace 60
- Dostoievsky and the Problem of Evil 137
- A Faith for Education 332
- The Jew in the Christian World 143
- The New Bible Study 335
- Twenty-one Years A-Building 58

Call for the Observance of the Universal Day of Prayer for Students 41

Christians in Europe 69

The Church and the Indian Tragedy 166

The Church and the Swedish S.C.M. 111

The Church in Mining and Urban Centres in Africa . 103

The Crisis in the American Universities 23

Editorials 1, 65, 145, 241

The Editor's Travel Diary 125, 223, 300

The Ethics of Political Resistance 245

A Faith for the University 15

India and the Future 160

PAGE

The Japanese S.C.M. in War Time 185

A Layman's Thoughts on Natural Law 257

A Letter from the Editor to His Friends in Europe . . 49

Moral Action for the Christian 250

Natural Law or Divine Law? 261

News Out of China 177

The People of God 90

A Plea for a Christian Ethic 271

Rebuilding a Chinese University 29

Student World Chronicle

- An African View of the S.C.M. 314
- An Australian View of the Religion of the Soldier . 53
- Christian Literary Criticism 310
- Karl Fries 233
- Our Youth Movements: A Youth Movement in the Church 131
- Scandinavian News and Views 237
- Students in Southwest China 133

Studies in the Fourth Gospel 43

Thinking Ahead as Christians

- Fragments of a Discussion in Europe 296
- Kenilworth and Poughkeepsie II Meetings . . . 207
- More Questions for Thinking Ahead 35
- Some Comments from National Student Christian Movements 290

Thoughts on France 148

PAGE

The University and the Spirit of Man 5

The War and the Church in Britain 118

The Youth Movements in the Church Militant . . 192

List of Authors

Alexander, J. C. 53

Annan, J. S. 314

Baker, Gilbert 133

Bennett, John C. 59, 81

Beyer, Charles Jacques 257

Bosc, Jean 5

Chang, Kuo-Hsing 29

Dietrich, Suzanne de 137, 192, 276

Durgin, Russell L. 185

Emmet, Dorothy 250

Frykholm, Yngve 111

Furfande, Michel 148

Herklots, H. G. G. 118

Hoffmann, Conrad, Jr. 143

House, Margaret 245

Jullien, C. 131

Kennedy, Donald 271

Lehmann, Paul 317

Mackenzie, Norman 60

PAGE

Mackie, Robert C. . 1, 49, 125, 145, 223, 233, 241, 300, 335

Macnicol, Nicol 160

Morton, Helen 58, 65, 177, 290

Mott, John R. 233

Nash, Arnold S. 15, 332

Roberts, Richard 43

Rodhe, Birgit 237

Rouse, Ruth 233

Shedd, Clarence P. 23

Singh, Surjit 166

Visser 't Hooft, W. A. 90, 261

Wrong, Margaret 103

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary

S933
W927

18,026

THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine of the World's Student Christian Federation

ROBERT C. MACKIE, *Editor*

Temporary addresses of the Editor, 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., U.S.A., and 151 Bloor Street W., Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada.

Volume XXXVI First Quarter, 1943 Number 1

EDITORIAL

The Crisis in the University

The crisis in the university must be regarded in two ways. It is plain to any observer that it has come upon the university from without. The story is by now a tragically familiar one for readers of THE STUDENT WORLD. *Crude nationalism has crushed universities, until out of them has trickled a thin stream of scholars, which was their life-blood. Ruthless imperialism has nailed up their doors and driven professors and students from their precincts. Relentless invasion has swept away whole institutions, so that only fragments can be pieced together a thousand miles away. Demands of the armed forces have emptied classrooms, and again filled them with the cadets of war on land, on sea and in the air. Never has the university been more profoundly affected by external events.*

Not all is loss. Speaking on the third anniversary of the shameful deeds which accompanied the closing of the University of Prague the Czechoslovak minister to Canada said to the University of Toronto: "These students suffered and died that other students might learn the cost of freedom." Through the very contrasts of our day, we are learning the value of objective study, of free discussion, and of disinterested service. It may be that those who some day return to the quadrangles will know why they have come back, more truly than their predecessors of 1919 knew.

Not all is loss. The dispersion of scholars has led in times past to the rebirth of culture. A glance at the map today shows how, by some strange trick of destiny, the universities of China and of Russia have been thrown back into the centre of that great landmass which we call Asia. There, amidst incredibly adverse circumstances, universities are being rebuilt on simple, heroic lines, and are of sheer necessity sharing their life with the common people.

In a more profound sense, however, the crisis has come upon the university from within. The signs of its coming were clearly apparent between the two wars. Four years ago an issue of The Student World *contained a group of articles, which were "at one in denying that the modern university is a university in any real sense of the word". Today outward events have helped us to see the inner situation more clearly. The university has lost its identity. It has not had a life of its own as distinct from the life of the world, the world of national interests and commercial competition. In peace it was designed to meet professional and business requirements, so in war what is asked of it is "officer material". The tragedy of the university is that it has not known its allegiance; and it has therefore been at the beck and call of any insistent voice. No wonder that the students, even in countries with political freedom, wonder whether their* alma mater *can really nourish them after all.*

Once again not all is loss. There is evidence of heart-searching amongst university men and women. There is less pride on the part of professors, less arrogance on the part of students. Where all is confusion it is necessary to keep together until the way forward be found. After the conventional outer defences have been broken down, there has been a rally to defend the citadel itself. Stories have come from occupied Europe of stands made on some half-forgotten principle, which have thrilled the whole world. Not all is loss. A Chinese professor remarked after the destruction of the outward form of his university by shells and explosives and fire: "We used to think the university had to do with buildings, but we have none; we used to think that it had to do with books, but we have few left; we have discovered that a university is where some men are prepared to teach and others prepared to learn." The rediscovery of the meaning of the university will have to go deeper than that, but it has begun to be made.

It must be made, for the situation is terribly urgent. We are already talking too easily in some countries about rebuilding university life. While gallant relief workers in China and Europe are saving what they can of this student generation for the future, we are beginning to plan in terms of world student relief. It is a noble enterprise, our duty and our privilege, but we are uncertain of the basic ground-plan of our rebuilding. It has been a revealing experience to tour the universities of the United States on behalf of the universities of China in their struggle for bare existence, and the improvised universities in the prison camps of Europe, while these highly equipped American institutions were one by one handing themselves over to the guidance of the military mind, because they did not have a clear idea of their own specific contribution to the struggle of the hour. We must become clear about the meaning and function of the university, or we shall find ourselves patching up an effete system, or, worse still, handing ourselves over to new forces of destruction.

This issue of THE STUDENT WORLD *is a modest contribution to this essential task of university men and women. It is not the thinking of the World's Student Christian Federation which is so outstanding in this matter, though there are searching and challenging statements in the articles which follow. The important fact is that the Federation believes the clue to this search is to be found in the Christian faith. Only a universal faith is of any service to a university, and the other absolutes have betrayed us. Can we learn what it means to rebuild the university in relation to the Christian revelation of God?*

It is vital to note that we are not here talking about applying Christianity, like a coat of paint, to the cracking surface of the university. In one South American university a figure of the Christ stands with arms outstretched above the entrance. It is a fine conception for university architecture, but the impression is modified when you learn that it is a recent attachment to an uninspiring structure. There is another South American university, which stands unscathed in a ruined city, because it was built upon earthquake-proof foundations. Without any reflection upon either of these particular institutions we may say that the second is the more fitting symbol of the true university. A decorative addition, even in the form of a new chapel, will not prevent a university from leading men to destruction. But, if a university is erected upon the proposition that this is God's world, it will not only not

imperil those who work in it, and live around it, but it will also provide them with a firm footing in the search for truth.

In this matter there is a danger into which the Christian forces in the university may readily fall; it is that they may talk big and do little. Our student Christian movements belong to the old conception of the university, they are more or less useful adjuncts to a system which tolerates them. They have their exclusiveness, and their divisions, their peculiar jargon and their petty pride; seldom do they seem to bear a profound relation to the life of the university as a whole. In the days ahead this situation will be altered, but perhaps not in the direction we should prefer. Either the Christian forces will be swept aside as wholly irrelevant to the new pagan purpose of the university, or they will become centres of that fresh life and aspiration which alone can save culture for the spirit of man. It is a tremendous task, and we must lay our plans accordingly.

R. C. M.

The University and the Spirit of Man

JEAN BOSC

What is the mission of the University? That is the question which we have to face. But at the same time this question raises others. Is it understood as a matter of course that the University has a mission? And are we clear what we are talking about when we talk of the University? It seems to me therefore that before approaching this subject we ought to come to some agreement about the terms employed.

What is the University?

First of all, what are we to understand by the term University? Even in current usage the word has several meanings. The University is a building, or a group of buildings, very much broken up into departments, which is intended to receive teachers who teach and students who are taught. But the term also covers a vast institution whose ramifications, supported by an important administration, extend over the entire area of the nation, and, in an entirely anonymous fashion, are responsible for public instruction. Finally it may refer to the official body of professors and teachers, sometimes indeed the collective entity found in the buildings of which we spoke.

Let us make it plain at the start that when we talk of the University we do not understand that term in any of the senses we have just indicated. In its origin the University was something wholly different. In the Middle Ages the name of *Studia Generalia* was given to the school or institution which gave instruction. The Universities were strictly speaking corporations formed by teachers and students in the defence of their own interests and to safeguard the liberties necessary for the exercise of their functions. That is to say that the essential characteristic of a University was that it should be a community. It was doubtless the *primordial* importance of this community and the rôle which it subsequently played which resulted in the prevalence of the term *University* to express the institution in its entirety. It may be that this community aspect has almost entirely disappeared from the University of today, which has become merely an

assemblage of individuals who, while doubtless united by similar preoccupations, do not form a corporation with one aim, and with interests, mission and welfare in common. But the fact remains that it is the teachers and students who make the active and vital element in the University and that there cannot be a University in any real sense of the word except in so far as teachers and students form a community. To form a community, there must be something in common. It cannot depend merely on inheritance from the past, for the past in itself is dead; it cannot mean only *interest,* for interest is a mere external link between different individuals: a syndicate is not a community. To create a community, a deeper bond is required—for example: a common task, a common mission, a common function.

The Mission of the University

If we say that the University has a mission, we mean that the living community of teachers and students has a mission or a function. This mission is undertaken and carried out in common. It is even the mission which creates the community. Everyone finds himself responsible for his own share. The teachers are there with another aim than just to give instruction or to hand out diplomas; the students have something to do besides attending courses or passing examinations: all are united by the definite task which they have to accomplish together. The special rôle of teacher or student merely indicates the place in which each one has to be a member of the University community.

But we must not forget that in speaking of the mission or the service of the University, we are not on the ground of objective speculation. It is rather the question of what we have to do and to be as teachers or as students. It is a matter of the responsibility which we share with others.

The Spirit of Man

Let us therefore examine this mission of the University, or rather the particular aspect of this mission which we might define as *Service of the Spirit of Man.* What in the first place is the spirit of man?

We must admit that the term "spirit" is frequently wrapped up in a general vagueness. To many people it represents a region which is extremely lofty, but wholly immaterial, and altogether

far removed from anything one may call practical and concrete life. We are certainly not referring to this vague and distant god when we speak however provisionally of the service of the *human* spirit. We would here consider under this term man's capacity to know and to think with all the consequences of these functions for his life and for that of the world.

The Bible can help us to understand this potentiality of man in speaking of his *responsibility*. The Bible tells us that man was created responsible, that is to say, capable of *response;* that distinguishes him from the other creatures. God created him thus in order to have facing Him a being to know and love Him as only His creation could know and love Him, to be a living link between Him and the world, to be capable of intercourse with Him. To *respond* means, in the Bible, to *be* wholly in what one *says*. In the Bible speech is an act—the highest act of all. To *respond* will then mean for man to *respond* on behalf of himself, and since he has been set as chief and lord over the works of the Eternal, to *respond* also on behalf of creation, in its place and for its sake. This *responsibility* presumes a knowledge of the beings for whom one *responds;* that is of oneself and of creatures, also an authority and a power exercised over them. When man speaks in the presence of his God, his understanding and his power, his thought and action are wholly present in his speech: he is a unity, body and soul, spirit and matter, thought and action. He has no thought which is not measured by his purpose; no action which is not closely dependent on his thought.

Man's failure and struggle

So at least was it at the first creation. But then there came the Fall, man refused his response to his Creator, and everything lost its true direction, everything broke up and was divided. Man no longer stands before God, bringing to Him in his response, in his words, one whole, his personality and that of the world in which he lives. Man has turned aside: he no longer feels responsible before his Lord either for himself or for the Creation. He has lost the unity of his thought, his authority and his power. The Creation, animate and inanimate, no longer obeys one who is himself disobedient. He no longer understands himself, nor does he understand what surrounds him. He lives in a state of divorce between body and soul, of thought and action, of spirit and matter.

Yet he goes on living: his Creator has left him that possibility, having still something to offer him. Man lives and struggles against death. He tries to understand himself and the world in which he is placed. He tries to regain power over animate and inanimate creation. He struggles to find a unity between his body and his soul. He fights in pain and suffering with a world which has become hostile, in order to live and not be crushed by it. He strives continually to understand and to think in order to win power and mastery. This effort of man is to be man, this labour to which he is destined and condemned, is found expressed in a culture and leaves its mark on civilisations: science and the arts and institutions are all a manifestation of it.

Further, the will to live must be there, and the desire to find a unity, and to affirm his existence: indeed man must have the will to fight and to conquer. For the force of division is always there and death is installed in the world. A moment always comes when man, if he has not been stopped earlier, ceases to struggle, sinks and dies. The same is true of nations, cultures and civilisations; the moment comes for them also when they cease to think of living, turn rather to the past and lose inclination to struggle, die slowly or suddenly. Division takes hold on them. One of the surest signs of this agony is the disappearance of creative work, of culture.

The disappearance of culture

It is at this point that our age has to face a searching question. Think of modern culture, which in most cases has become a superfluous luxury without an essential relation to the existence of mankind. The industrialist and the business man, after leaving their daily task, their subjection to the economic order and technology, even their family and social life, find an ineffectual haven in their novels, their books of history, their picture galleries, or their religion; yet they have no true culture, however high a point of refinement they may seem to have reached. Their life is divided, thought from action, spirit from matter, body from soul. And what shall we say of the proletariat who only have a share in culture through the unexacting distractions of the newspaper, the radio or the cinema?

Let us think chiefly of the University, where science is subject to the scientists. The scientists in most cases do not seek to know in order to live. They are hypnotised by facts and bound

hand and foot to scientific skill. They analyse matter, but the spirit is not there. This is what Kierkegaard emphasised with regard to a particular domain, that of the natural sciences. "If I cast a glance on this domain," he wrote (and he included here all who seek to understand and to decipher the rules of nature, from the scientist who calculates the speed of the stars and seems to arrest their course in order to scrutinise them more closely, to him who describes the physiology of such and such an animal; from the scientist who looks down on the surface of the earth from the high mountains, to him who descends into the abyss; from him who pursues the formation of the human body through its countless shades, to him who observes the worms in the intestines), "I can see naturally here as elsewhere (but here in particular) examples of men who have made a name in science by an immense patience in collecting. They know a great quantity of details and have found many others, but that is all. What have they to offer but a substratum to the reflection and the work of others? And yet we see our people contented with all these accumulated minor facts. They remind me of the rich farmer in the Gospel: they have laid up stores for themselves, yet science can say to them: 'Tomorrow I shall demand your life.'" (Journal.)

Nature and Science, the University and the scientist and scholar are standing side by side, outside life—their own personal life as well as the life of the world. When intellectuals are not talking of knowledge for the sake of knowledge, or culture for culture's sake, they are aiming at utilitarianism, the immediate practical and industrial utilisation of their knowledge. Between these two possibilities, they are not aware of a human choice. They are in an ivory tower, they are spirit far removed from matter, thought removed from action, soul without body. And during this time, men and nations live and die within matter and action, within a body that lacks a soul: the world is turning to the beast. "Man is neither angel nor beast: he who would achieve the angel, only achieves the beast."

The service of the spirit of man

We may now understand a little better the nature of the service of the spirit of man. It is the effort to help the spirit to become human, that is, to share in man's work and in his struggle to survive. Naturally it is concerned with man's thought as

applied to every object: with his knowledge of himself and of the world, of culture and science, of art, morality and philosophy. But all these things may point to death and not to the service of the human spirit if they are not understood from the human angle, if they are not the expression of man's striving towards his own unity, if his spirit is not aided to form and master matter, if thought is not incarnated in action.

Let nobody think that this has anything to do with the subjection of the spirit of man. If the human spirit is to be itself it must remain free, that is to say it must not be the human slave of any outward power. This subjection assuredly represents a danger which men can often not avoid, but which reappears continually under different forms. The human spirit can make itself independent of material interests. It can become the slave of the powers of this world, whether political, economic or ideological; it can be chained by *a prioris* of every kind. History and our present world are literally swarming with examples of such slavery of the spirit. It is clear that the subjection of the spirit is the negation of the spirit. For scientific research, art and culture are only living realities in so far as the spirit of which they are the fruits maintains its authority over the concerns which it weighs and directs.

But this spirit is only with equal truth human spirit in so far as it is truly reality, creatures and created and living things, that it weighs, directs and inspires. There is no *human* spirit except it be enjoyed in the reality of life, that is to say incarnate. There is no culture except when man, directed by his spirit, *works*, that is to say is moulded by the land to which he belongs, and moulds it in his turn. This does not mean that action should be made the goal of life, but that the human spirit should be so deeply engaged in human life that action comes to birth from its labour. The human spirit has only meaning in so far as it gives a life, a nation, a civilisation their spiritual roots, just as a life, a nation, a civilisation cannot live unless they grow from spiritual roots.

The function of the university

The primary function of the University is the service of the spirit of man, which is to say it must be the place in which one is assured that man's life, his being and activities, are conceived, scrutinised and known, that the world can be discovered, known and directed to a certain end. The University to be sure has no

monopoly of this task. Science is to be found in other places, and culture is not the exclusive appanage of intellectuals only, but is a *human* concern.

But here, in the University, we are to demand and to safeguard this liberty of spirit which is necessary for its authority and which is so often compromised. And we can see to it that the spirit of man should continue to be at work in the world and accomplish his work of direction and inspiration. And that is why the proper function of the University is scientific research and culture. *This* is its work, and like all human work, it has the right to be done in the highest seriousness and with the strictest honesty.

Finally we must remember that it is the University community which is in the service of the spirit of man. That is, not the impersonal entity or the institution which we call University, but the body of teachers and students—for from the moment when this service of the spirit of man is taken seriously, it is no longer the individual destiny or career which counts for each one, but the common function which is corporately assumed, one for another and one with another. A fine career, a good degree, a settled job—all of these are objects which blot themselves out behind the common will to serve the spirit of man. Each individual must, without doubt, develop and assert himself, and devote all his resources, but this is done within the framework of the common function. It is the unity of this function, it is this service which controls the community and makes of it a living body. This is the University we must hope for. We must not wait until educational reform achieves it: administrative decisions cannot bring it to birth. It is we who must desire it, and desiring it means to put ourselves, each one of us in his turn, and one with another, in the service of the spirit of man; and that means for each one of us the discovery, in his own life, and in the University community of the sense of a living culture and of a real knowledge.

The spirit of man, slave or free?

But a last question faces us. It is not enough to desire a University which will be a community in the service of the spirit of man and of the spirit engaged in struggle. We must also know in what direction the spirit is struggling, to what anchor it holds, what spiritual values it will assert, what basis it will give

for action. Here once more the Scriptures shed a revealing and searching light. In the biblical vocabulary the word "spirit" does not mean the thought or intelligence of man. The spirit is in the first place that which communicates human life to the human being as to every living thing. But this spirit has no autonomous existence, it is not independent. At the beginning, in God's creation, the life which man received by the spirit was given him by a permanent communion of God with the Holy Spirit. By his spirit held in submission to the Holy Spirit, man knew his God, and obeyed Him in the liberty of love. In the Fall man sought to free himself from his dependence, but in fact he abandoned his liberty of spirit which essentially consists in his power of living before God and of knowing everything through Him. The spirit of man cannot be independent: in turning aside from the One Who truly inspires him he has become the slave of evil spirits, of all the powers of heaven or earth which surround him and spy upon him in the cosmic disorder which comes upon the world and which the Bible enumerates or sums up under the general term of "spirit of the world". A nation or a civilisation can perfectly distinguish spiritual values which are certain in the eyes of men, but are in submission to the spirit of the world. In Jesus Christ alone, Who is the Truth and the foundation of all real knowledge of man and of the world, and through the Holy Spirit, can the human spirit be liberated from slavery to evil spirits, and receive the power to submit to the Spirit of God, which is a "spirit of wisdom and revelation". Through the Holy Spirit power is given to man to know in Jesus Christ the end of all things as his own end. Besides every man is faced with this choice: to remain a slave of the spirits of this world, or to yield, through the Holy Spirit, to the knowledge of God and to liberty, since "where the Spirit of God is, there is liberty." Man who lives in faith is invited each day of his life to make the choice, to "believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God" (I John 4: 1).

Many different spirits may reign in the University: the postulates of science or of culture are signs of them. The Christian man is called to discern them that he may submit to those alone which recognise the authority of their Creator. This does not mean that there are no spiritual values but religious ones. Everything belongs to Christ; which means that there is neither sacred nor profane. Art and literature, the drama and law are all

spiritual values: but they may be animated by false spirits or by true, by demons or by the Holy Spirit. It is our part to choose which we shall serve, and which we would have our country serve with all its cultural and spiritual inheritance.

Faith and culture

This faces us with a question of the highest importance. If the service of the spirit of man can only be actually achieved in submission to the Holy Spirit, that is because there is a culture and a scientific research whose deepest inspiration can only come from the preaching of the Holy Spirit. This does not mean that faith has to dictate to science its methods and its results, but that it is able to submit them to the Holy Spirit. And if this is really true, one is led to suppose that a University founded upon this faith is a thing to hope for. Of course we may have reserves about the possibility or the opportunity for such a realisation. Yet can there be elsewhere than in Jesus Christ a community with deep roots? Can there exist save in submission to the Holy Spirit a veritable service of the spirit of man? It seems as if such a University might be a witness in the world to a real service of the spirit of man.

The University in the common life

It is in serving the spirit of man that the University also serves men. It is not an isolated community in the nation or in the civilised world. It plays its part in regional and national life, as well as life on a wider scale. We have seen that the service of the spirit must always be the service of an incarnate spirit. The University accomplishes its work in a certain place and at a certain moment of history. It is its aim and its duty to animate the existence of the men and the communities with which and of whose life it lives. It is certain, for instance, that in these times when the national life has profound reality, a French University must serve the national community. There is a history, a conception of life, a tradition, a culture in France which the University is called to give its true place, to rediscover, to continue. It must undertake the responsibility of nourishing the spiritual life of the country. In doing this it will share in the fulfilment of its own particular mission, among the people to which it belongs, and will serve other nations as well. For too long a period the University has remained in its ivory tower,

believing that it should or indeed could escape earthly contingencies. It is time for it to resume its place and its function in common life.

But the University can only in reality serve men if it is in truth dedicated to the service of the spirit of man. This is no matter of restoring the easiest or the most comfortable life to men, or of misleading them with regard to existence. The University is there to remind them that *human* life cannot exist save in the service of the spirit, to make them recollect the needs of the spirit, and to assure the permanence of spiritual values.

We have seen that this service of the spirit of man only finds its true direction in submission to the Holy Spirit. It is this fact which lays upon us who are Christians so peculiar and so imperative a responsibility.

A Faith for the University

Arnold S. Nash

In a previous article in this issue Jean Bosc has dealt with the important question of the mission of the university. To read his essay is immediately to be precipitated into a consideration of the complementary problem of where shall the university derive the content of its mission, its message.

The end of an order

The "modern" world has come to an end. In economic life, it began with the transformation of feudalism into "free" merchant capitalism; it is ending with the transition from finance-monopoly capitalism into state-controlled collectivism. In political life, it began with the collapse of Christendom as a political unit to produce the modern nation-state; it is ending with some type of "New Order" based on a limitation of national sovereignty.[1]

The world of scholarship has not escaped. The "modern" world, intellectually speaking, began with the emergence of the experimental method in science and the critical view of history as patterns for correct thinking when scholastic philosophy with its three-fold division into natural, mental and moral philosophy, collapsed. We moderns smile at such a division of the university curricula and still more at the attendant *trivium* of grammar, rhetoric and logic and the *quadrivium* of arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy. But is not God already rebuking us for our superiority by showing by events that our contemporary division of human knowledge as indicated by the contents of the contemporary university catalogue is equally out of date? Indeed such catalogues are becoming like those medieval maps which

[1]If this process is not brought to its conclusion then not merely "modern" history but "human" history will end in World War III.

adorn the walls of country houses in England; they have decorative value but for practical purposes serious revision is needed. In short the modern university, having fashioned its thinking for every subject in its curriculum on the natural sciences, must now face the fact that this model of correct thinking is no better fitted to explain (let alone change) the contemporary world than the scholastic model was adequate for the intellectual demands of a world built on rising capitalism.

A faith for a new order

From whence shall the university of the coming new order derive its sustenance for its future task? Liberal democratic culture itself is powerless precisely because it has not yet given up its proud self-confidence that it can save itself. It still believes that if man is not perfect, he is, like the world itself, nevertheless improving and that science, as the only way of reaching truth is the main agent whereby—through education—this process can be maintained. In a day when the optimistic presuppositions of a culture are so obviously at variance with the fate of the civilisation on which that culture depends, it is clear that a fresh source of wisdom is needed. And from where can that wisdom come unless it be from a re-interpretation of a faith, Christianity, which has outlasted the fall of, and therefore has a source beyond, many civilisations?

Western civilisation at the present juncture is not unlike imperial Rome during the third century. In each case a tremendous social structure has had no purpose outside its own maintenance and that is why in each age the learned men have sought refuge in cynicism whilst the common people, in fear of the unknown, have followed astrologers and the like. In Gibbon's famous words, all religions, like all philosophies, were to the learned equally false, to the ignorant equally true, and to the magistrates equally useful.

Imperial Rome, seeking a faith which could justify its existence, seized upon Christianity and under Constantine sought to achieve the imperial dream of permanent peace by harnessing the force of the growing Christian Church. However it was in vain. Rome fell but Christianity produced Augustine to lay the spiritual and indeed the intellectual foundations of a culture that for nearly a thousand years shone brilliantly in literature, painting, architecture and philosophy.

The crisis of culture

But that culture, too, reached its crisis. To translate literally the Greek word *krisis* (from which we get our anglicised *crisis*), *judgment* was uttered over medieval culture and it collapsed. Judgment is the perennial fate of all cultures. It is the time in the affairs of men, nations or civilisations when their shortcomings can no longer be ignored and they are called to account. Particularly is this true of the thought of an epoch for then the unforeseen tendencies of its theories, their inner contradictions and their ultimate conclusions, become evident not only because new light is thrown upon them but mainly because they reveal themselves as inadequate in their application. Moreover we can say that each crisis in the life of nations, universities, churches or civilisations is the expression of a judgment on the ideas that have inspired them. However, crisis is something more than judgment. For a time of crisis is also one of opportunity. The Chinese (and, following them the Japanese) in their wisdom make up the ideography equivalent to the English "crisis" by using two characters. One means opportunity and the other means danger.

Under the leadership of Augustine, the Christian Church in the early years of the Fifth Century was enabled to seize its opportunities and steer a passage amid the dangers of the Gothic invasions of the Empire. Can contemporary Christian thinkers perform for their day and generation the equivalent of Augustine's service to declining Rome? Can they ensure that, in the coming intellectual reconstruction, a new interpretation of the specifically Christian insights into the nature of man and the significance of the historical process will replace the twin pillars of the optimistic view of human nature and the inevitability of progress upon which—in spite of their shaky foundations—the structure of modern knowledge was built?

In the midst of a revolution

The answer is that they can if they will only recognise that we do *really* live in a revolutionary situation. For the World's Student Christian Federation this means that it is no use proclaiming, for example, that the political order must be reconstructed or that industry must be basically reformed. As J. H. Oldham has pointedly reminded us, the besetting sin of Chris-

tians is to draw up blue prints in spheres where they have no control instead of attempting a few reforms in spheres where they have.

This plainly means that the Federation, like its constituent movements, must recognise and act upon the recognition that it is itself in a revolutionary phase. It can either accept that fact and seek under God *consciously* to guide its destiny in the world now being born or it can proceed *unconsciously* on the basis of conviction that although industry, politics, the universities, the Churches and so on, must be revolutionised yet the Federation can carry on unchanged by the forces which precipitated the present cataclysm.

We can be humbly thankful to God for the signs of the times which indicate that the Student Christian Movements throughout the world are recognising what is nothing less than God's call for our time; it is to undertake a mission *to the University* and not just to its students. It was graphically put in our Chairman's letter when last year he wrote:

"Let no one think that the problem of the post-war world is essentially a technical problem and that a bit of political engineering will settle the issue. For there can be no order without a common 'frame of reference'. And the real problem which we must face is the spiritual one as to what will be the main common convictions which will underlie the coming order."[1]

In other words, Dr. Visser 't Hooft is challenging us to accept the responsibility which our Editor had in mind when he chose the title "Thinking Together as Christians" for a subsequent issue of The Student World.

A living idea

This recognition that the crying need of the time is, to use T. S. Eliot's phrase, to think in Christian categories, is not limited to our officers. It is a *living* idea that repeatedly crops up in the literature of the national movements. Perhaps its most moving expression is Daniel Jenkins' "sermon" in the British *Student Movement*[2] with the title *Babel and Jerusalem: Evangelism in the University* and on the text, "bringing every thought into the captivity of Christ" (II Cor. 10: 5). His warning is salutary

[1] The Student World, Fourth Quarter, 1941, p. 283.
[2] June, 1942.

to those of us who would rush ahead with that self-confidence which shows how much the rust of a liberal capitalist culture has eaten into our souls. He writes:

> "We have hardly begun to understand how comprehensive is our Lord's claim over our minds, nor have we yet known enough of His power to be honestly certain that it is 'mighty to the casting down of strongholds'. No people are more guilty of making large claims and doing very little to justify them than Christians in these days and in the university of all places we should cultivate a proper sobriety. It is not wise to challenge Pharaoh's magicians to turn their staffs into serpents unless we are absolutely sure for ourselves that our serpents are able to eat theirs.
>
> "There is no short cut to saving the university, and the road to its salvation is a long and stony one. Our only effective form of evangelism is to behave ourselves like Christians in the sphere which is the distinctive concern of the university, that of the mind."

In so-called "practical" terms this living idea of "Christian thinking" as distinct from "thinking about Christian subjects" appears in the American movement in the frequency with which the question appears: "What is the difference between thinking as a Christian and thinking as a Marxist when both want an economy planned for the common good?"

Educating the professors

In Canada this living idea was expressed in the remarks of a student of McGill University at a recent conference to the effect that the task of the S.C.M. is "to educate the professors and build an S.C.M. *into* the University". It is also in Canada that it has received its expression in terms which carry the most disturbing implications, disturbing not to truth but to our traditions. One of its secretaries in conversation with the writer, raised the question of whether the study circle method, characteristic of the British and the Canadian movements, may not simply be the expression of our adherence to a liberal Protestant philosophy of religious education. That philosophy is now outworn; might it not be, he added, that if we adopt a neo-orthodox philosophy of religious education then we shall have to adopt a technique as

different from study circles as Reinhold Niebuhr's theology is different from that of Horace Bushnell?[1]

The analysis which lay behind this question is of more than Canadian significance. It touches at the root of the dilemma in which any Christian movement finds itself in any university in our liberal democratic culture, viz., how can a movement which takes its stand on revealed knowledge speak in intelligible terms to a university which bases itself explicitly on secular knowledge, and often by implication denies the possibility or at least the relevance of revealed knowledge? The Canadian S.C.M. secretary in question then went on to point out that so long as the S.C.M. is implicitly liberal Protestant in its theology then the dilemma does not appear, for liberal Protestantism removes the dilemma by removing revelation. Hence, in the past a study circle, in terms of this theology has been, not an instrument to proclaim a truth which the liberal democratic university does not know, but a field upon which both the Christian and the secular student can meet on a common ground because essentially they start from the same premises.

The university must glorify God

In the French S.C.M. utterance has been given to convictions as to the mission of the S.C.M. to the university in terms which are strikingly similar to the analyses of this Canadian leader. Just before the war began, a conference on "The Christian University" was held at Bièvres; it recorded its conclusion that

> "essential as it is, it is not enough to proclaim the Gospel to students and to glorify God *in* the University; but the university itself must also glorify God, and our studies must themselves be offered as a sacrifice to God. Too often we are content to say and to go on saying that science and philosophy and all the wisdom of this world cannot bring salvation to man. We ought to tell the university that it does not know—how indeed should it know?—what it means for a Christian to be a scholar, to be a philosopher, to be an historian. We have no difficulty in renouncing all such heresies as 'Christian' science or 'Christian' philosophy; but we cannot give up seeking what God demands of us when He gives us a vocation to be scholars, philosophers, and historians."

[1]The founder of liberal Protestant religious education in the U.S.A.

On the other side of the world this living idea is struggling to break through the traditional modes of thinking and conduct within the Federation. Space demands that I limit myself to Australia and the line of argument to which Kurt Schechner has given such lucid utterance.[1] He points out that in the intellectual realm as Christian students we must discover the relevance of Christian presuppositions to our secular knowledge. He illustrated his thesis by considering law, history, economics and biology and he made the all-important point that within this sphere it is to Christian laymen among scientists, historians, psychologists and the like that we must look to become what Alan Richardson of the British S.C.M. aptly calls "lay-theologians".

A task for the Federation

What therefore is the conclusion of the matter? Is it not that the Federation must take the lead among the Christian forces of the world in working out a Christian world-view within which the conclusions of the specialised subjects of the university curriculum can be given their ultimate meaning in terms of a specifically Christian philosophy of man and of his relation to the historical process? There is no other organisation in Christendom which has such intimate and world wide contacts with the Christians who as scientists, historians and scholars are the only people who can do it. Perhaps in making this appeal I am echoing the argument of our chairman when he concluded his essay on *Christianity and the University World* in *None Other Gods* with the words "we need very specially a Christian Professors' Movement". His remarks embodied what was then (in 1937) a prophecy. Is it not today God's word of command to the Federation as it attempts to discover the part it should play in the future "New Order"? The Federation can only fulfil its mission to the university in so far as through its constituent movements it can unite both professors and students to undertake a four-fold task:

1. to discover an answer not only to the question: "How can we as individuals serve God in the University?" but also to the question: "How can the liberal democratic University itself be a witness to the Glory of God?"

[1]See report of a speech at the Sydney University S.C.M. Conference, May, 1940, recorded in *The Australian Intercollegian,* Volume XLIII, pp. 105-07.

2. to discover the meaning of Christian vocation for a man or woman who is a chemist, sociologist, historian, psychologist, mathematician and the like.

3. to apply Christian criteria in working out the presuppositions which are relevant to the study of individual academic subjects and to discover the place in a Christian *speculum mentis* of the knowledge given in such specialised subjects.

4. to work towards a synthesis of knowledge for the twentieth century which, as an interpretation of human life and destiny, can be set over against the positivistic or Marxist or liberal humanitarian *Weltanschauungen* now current in the liberal democratic world. Such a *speculum mentis* will be dialectical between the two poles of unity and freedom. Like scholasticism it will derive its unity from its theological basis which will provide its presuppositions. But it will differ from scholasticism in that the specifically theological sections of such a map will not determine the nature and character of the "non-theological" sections. God, not theology or any other system, is sovereign.

The Crisis in the American Universities

Clarence P. Shedd

" 'Education and scholarship as usual' is no slogan for these days," says President James B. Conant of Harvard, and with this statement one can hardly disagree. Obviously, total war forces the colleges to abandon the "ivory tower" and make radical changes in their ways of living, course offerings, and instructional methods. In that sense "education as usual" is an inadequate slogan. The exigencies of this moment, however, pose a deeper problem for the colleges; will they be so overwhelmed by the demands of the armed forces for training that they will betray the vocation of the college? Will they cheat this present generation of students by failing to share with them the culture of the past and to prepare them for their part in a post-war reconstruction based on a just and durable peace? Is it an adequate view of the total demands of total war that, as Dr. Conant told Harvard freshmen on October 6, "only a trace of the broadening background of a liberal arts college curriculum can survive these grim days"? Must we wait, as Dr. Conant further suggests, "until the war is won . . . for the true purpose of education again to be in the forefront"? Are the colleges and universities to become merely or solely "military academies", "war colleges", or "trade schools"? Are propaganda and training—much of it subcollegiate in character—to take the place of education? Who dictates what the colleges are to teach?

In an address to his incoming freshmen, President Alexander G. Ruthven of the University of Michigan criticised the "misguided zeal" of educators who "would make war colleges out of our educational institutions". "If we orient and rigidly align our students in war work, . . . we will become trade schools. The universities," he said, "have a responsibility to turn out citizens who can function in a democracy as well as to train 'fighting men'. . . ."

"Let the College be the College"

Never has higher education faced so grave a crisis. For the college can play the all-out part it desires to play in winning the war and the peace, only if it is free to function in its own character, performing collegiate, not subcollegiate, functions. The words "Let the college be the college" should be written in large letters over every administrative desk "for the duration". Much education as usual must go forward, no matter how heavy the demands for military training which total war places upon our colleges.

These questions come to the colleges and universities with a terrifying sense of urgency. Since January administrators have been working on a plan, approved by the Selective Service and by Army and Navy, which with accelerated programme and Enlisted Reserves geared the colleges completely into the total war effort, created a reservoir of leaders for the armed forces, and made possible for most students the completion of the college course before induction into the armed forces. The events of the past two months have destroyed this carefully erected house of cards. In late August the 500 educators assembled in Washington for the National Institute of Education and War were told that the "keystone of present national policy", as adopted by the Man Power Commission, was that "every able-bodied student was destined for the armed forces", that "all students were living on borrowed time". Then came President Roosevelt's Columbus Day speech, followed by Congressional action to lower the draft age to eighteen.

A coherent national policy is needed

"Let us be realistic," said Lieut.-Gen. Brehon B. Somervell. "Every classroom is a citadel. . . . The colleges must help to equip the student for his place in the armed forces regardless of cost, time, inconvenience, temporary sidetracking of non-war objectives, or even the temporary scrapping of peace-time courses." On September 10 and 17 these statements were given more official standing for the War Department when Secretary Henry L. Stimson declared that by the end of the term or semester beginning in September, all students in the army reserves who have reached selective service age would be called to active duty, regardless of their status under the accelerated plan. Moreover, the colleges were warned by Mr. McNutt that

the forces of government expected the colleges to bring down to a minimum all courses without immediate utility in the preparation of students for the armed forces.

Panic followed these declarations, for agreements made by the colleges with their students in good faith suddenly seemed to have become "scraps of paper". "The best way to lose the war is to draft all youthful brain power now," wrote President Charles G. Turck, of Macalester College. With the lowering of the draft age to 18, there appeared to be little chance that many students now in college could secure their degrees.

President Henry Wriston of Brown denounced the statements by Secretary Stimson "as a clear reversal of War Department policy". He pleaded for some coherent national policy, for "since the advent of the crisis the colleges and their students had been subjected to a barrage of advice and instruction, conflicting statements, warnings and threats by public officials and military officers", making the "task of the college needlessly difficult".

It is a striking and sobering fact that stronger protests have come from the large state universities and smaller church-related colleges than from the older private universities. Perhaps the most searching and yet constructive protest came from President Frank Graham of the University of North Carolina in a telegram sent to the Secretary of War on September 11 (the day following Secretary Stimson's statement), "reaffirming the university's all-out service to win the war" but pointing out "the obligation of the university not only to prepare men for the armed forces but to train all the necessary technicians and professional experts and leaders in every field of duty of war and for the humane and hopeful work of reconstruction after the war". Calling for a united "federal plan and programme", Dr. Graham on behalf of the University Board of Overseers said: "We must bespeak your leadership for a total training programme for a total war", stating further that "without the support of the back lines of agriculture, industry, commerce, education and the professions there will be no front lines." Here is a point of view and a platform to which all can subscribe who believe that, in "an all-out service to win the war and the peace", the college has a responsibility vastly greater than that of offering pre-induction courses, imperative as may be the need for these. It also has a realism about the total university job and the undergraduate situation not found in the statements of many presidents or officers of government.

These facts are basic

While the colleges and universities wait for some coherent national policy freeing them for "all-out service", they may well remind themselves of certain factors regarding the immediate situation which form the background against which they formulate their immediate, if not long-range, policies.

(1) The colleges must be given the green light to proceed unhampered with their work of preparing men and women for *all the tasks of war and reconstruction and of educating students for life and the tasks of citizenship*. Otherwise the incentives to enter or remain in college will be greatly weakened and there will be disaster for many of our institutions of higher education and an impoverishment of our culture for the future.

(2) However large and numerous the special training units, their presence should not obscure the fact that these special units are following officers' training programmes of their own and under the complete control—however great may be the university's contribution—of the branch of the armed forces involved and that alongside of the work of these training units the college or university, in most of its departments, is carrying on its normal task of educating youth as usual. In most of the large middle western universities—except for some crowding and inconvenience—the programmes of special officers' training and of "education as usual" go on side by side, to a large degree independent of each other.

(3) It is a fair guess that even if there is long delay in evolving a single coherent national policy, the colleges throughout the present year will have a fair proportion of the students who have entered for regular college work. Hence there rests upon the colleges a heavy obligation to "continue as institutions of higher education". We dare not betray the students or the future by any lowering of the quality of our work. In the meantime some national plan for assignment or deferment may keep many of them in college longer than we now believe. Many of those now in college, whether in the enlisted reserves or not, are likely to be allowed to remain after they become of draft age to continue types of special education that the college can better give than the Army or Navy. One cannot therefore colour too strongly the instruction of such regular students with courses which are of a pre-induction character for the armed forces.

If we can learn from the experience of British universities we will discover ways of keeping the flow of students into the universities, stabilising their finances, and alongside of officer training keep going much of the work of *education as usual.*

(4) The presence of women students in the great majority of institutions of higher learning forces those institutions to continue for both men and women most of the fundamental courses in the arts and sciences and education. Neither the widening array of war service courses for women nor the opening up of opportunities in war industries nor in the armed forces alters this obligation to continue the basic work of education now and for the duration. On women will rest heavy burdens for leadership in post-war reconstruction. The colleges must get ready *now.*

(5) The institutions of higher learning have a sacred responsibility to defend the sciences and arts from complete preoccupation or expropriation for the immediate ends of total war. If the lights of civilisation are to continue to burn, however dimly, then efforts to limit the work of education and scholarship wholly to technological and scientific disciplines must be stoutly resisted. It is proper to respond to the request of government for such special courses as help the armed forces and the war industries win this total war, but it is a betrayal of the present and the future for the colleges to allow such immediate new tasks to blot out the contributions which the humanities and arts have to make to the winning of this total war and to training for reconstruction. It is a false view of social change to believe that you leave the works of construction to be started after the works of destruction are ended. Rather, destruction and construction go on together, and failure to begin now the work of reconstruction and the training for after-war leadership in them may lead us again into a situation where we win a war and lose a peace.

The College must find itself

We need much clearer thinking than we have a right to expect from those who deal solely with the man power problem of the armed forces about what it is that really prepares young men and young women to take their part in this total war. How can the colleges respond adequately to President Roosevelt's stir-

ring challenge to "help us mould men and women who can fight through to victory"? How can the colleges answer his "prayer", "that young people will learn in the schools and colleges the . . . forbearance and patience needed by men and women of good will who seek to bring to this earth a lasting peace?" Certainly not alone or primarily by centering on pre-induction courses for service in the armed forces. Certainly not by making "a citadel out of every classroom" or substituting tactics for classes.

Never has it been more important that the college find itself and assert its true vocation in a war-torn world. Welcoming new students at the University of Chicago on September 22, President Robert M. Hutchins declared: "I reject in strongest terms Mr. McNutt's assertion that non-essential courses must be replaced by subjects of immediate utility in winning the war. . . . Technology will not solve all our problems . . . nor will technology establish a just and lasting peace. What will win the war and establish a lasting peace are educated citizens. The courses which will be of greatest utility in winning the war are not those of immediate practical utility but those which teach you as citizens to think."

Lord Bryce, speaking of a moment of history as dark as the present, said: "We must serve our day without yielding to it." If our colleges play their total part in this total war, they will not only give all-out preparation for the nation's armed forces but will lift higher than ever those disciplines of mind and spirit which create intelligence, imagination, spiritual insight and moral courage, enabling leaders to arise who "hope for" and "do the best things in the most calamitous times"—rebuilding, even while the work of destruction goes on. Only so can there be hope of a time "when the lights go on again all over the world".

Rebuilding a Chinese University[1]

CHANG KUO-HSING

Kunming, the provincial capital of Yunnan, has recently come into the limelight. Until a few years back, it was a city of little worth and fame, though about two thousand years ago the famous warriors of the Three Kingdoms marched on its narrow streets. Kunming has now emerged into national importance as a rear base for our war with Japan, a pivotal point in our gigantic plan of reconstruction and a nerve centre of communications in Free China. It was here that General Tang Chi Yao first raised the voice of opposition that echoed and re-echoed throughout the length and breadth of China against the counter-revolution for the restoration of the monarchical system in China in 1915.

An ancient and modern environment

Kunming is now a new city, prosperous, vibrant with business activities, with modern streamlined limousines whizzing through its streets, which are overlaid with flat blocks of limestone. It truly has the appearance of a senile old man rejuvenated with some monkey glands! Reconstruction is being strenuously carried on in spite of the war. Towering buildings of modern structure are springing up like mushrooms. Cinema halls and other amusements are available. Wedged between the ancient battered city walls in the western outskirts and the mighty range of mountains that runs a complete circle around the plateau on which Kunming is built, enveloping within its folds the picturesque Kunming Loch, is a cluster of small rectangular blocks of mud-sheds, all of a makeshift character, some with thatched roofs and others covered with corrugated iron, presenting an appearance of Army Barracks. Therein lies one of the highest seats of learning in Free China—the National South West Associated University, widely recognised as the leading Chinese university!

The environment has poetic inspiration. The ancient wall is an unfailing reminder of the ancient greatness of China; the mighty mountain range inspires us with lofty ideals and ambi-

[1]This interesting account was written in October, 1940.

tions; and the serene sky above crowns us with clarity of vision and rationality in thought! Such inspirational environment compensates us to a certain extent for our material lacks.

Three Universities in one

The National South West Associated University, or Lienta in abbreviated form, is composed of three of the foremost universities of China—the National Peking University, the Tsinghua University, and Nankai. After the outbreak of the war, the three universities moved *en masse* to Changsha, where for reasons of attaining greater efficiency and convenience they were incorporated into one Provisional Associated University. But before long they were compelled to move again. This time they moved to Kunming, which is rendered inaccessible to the Nipponese by natural mountain barriers, and were re-christened the National South West Associated University. Of course, such an association or amalgamation is only a provisional arrangement to meet wartime conditions. At the conclusion of the war Lienta will separate into the three original universities again.

Thus after a long, tedious march from Peiping to Kunming of over two thousand miles, a distance of the whole length of the United States from East to West, we are again able to settle down to our studies. This long march is a sorrowful, but significant chapter of hardships and courageous deeds in the educational history of China. When we arrived here in 1938, we thought that at long last we had reached our haven of refuge, where we could study our books in peace. But recent bombings in Kunming have belied our hopes! Kunming is merely an inn, where we can only stop for a short rest and change our post horses. We may have to move on, again! Oh! Poor Lienta! You are really a nomadic university! But, come what may, we are ready to face any situation. We are determined to keep in healthy circulation the educational strain in the blood of our New China.

Shortage of books

Since our University moved to Kunming, we have been facing the big problem of material insufficiency, such as the shortage in housing accommodation, of laboratory equipment, of books, etc. We also don't have enough professors. The shortage in

classrooms and professors has made necessary large unwieldy classes, sometimes of over 400 students. In respect to laboratory equipment, I may say that the only equipment we have for a biological experiment class of over a hundred students is a few microscopes. The shortage of books is our greatest problem and is our most serious handicap in the pursuit of knowledge. Our library is very poorly supplied with books. A few months ago, we received a gift of over a thousand books from Oxford University and you can imagine what a tremendous gift it is! The shortage is specially serious in regard to reference books. For instance, for two Western History classes of over 700 students we have only three copies of World History, by Hayes, Moon and Wayland. Hence there is a perpetual scramble to borrow reference books from our library. In order to ensure against disappointment, many students have to go to the library half an hour before it is opened. They have to line up outside the library door in a long "book queue". This kind of book queue is perhaps unknown outside China.

The books in our library are as jealously guarded as treasures. To borrow a book is a serious commitment! We have to surrender to the librarian our student's certificate, which is our most important possession in college. We have to return the book before the library is closed. We are not permitted to take it out. Violation of this regulation is considered one of the highest offences against the school, punishable in the first degree. The magazine section of our library is never known to have a journal which can be considered to be reasonably up-to-date. The latest paper from the nearest place is always at least two weeks behind time. Our contact with the outside world is really negligible. We feel as if we are shut up in a dark cell of intellectual isolation. Sometimes we even feel that we are in a vacuum. Such conditions greatly hamper us in our pursuit of knowledge.

Our classrooms are either makeshift mudsheds or some battered rooms in a dilapidated building. In America, they would have to undergo extensive repairs in order to be suitable as garages. The rooms are too small for our unusually large classes. Many students have to stay outside the classroom and sit down on the ground to take notes. There are students who have attended lectures for the whole semester without having the chance to see the face of the professor, because they have to stay outside the lecture room for all the lectures.

A scrambling life

Such an all-round shortage has cultivated a fast tempo of life of an American type among our student body. They have to scramble hard for almost everything. Life in Lienta is really a continuous scramble! We don't give any precedence or gentlemanly treatment to our co-eds. There is no "lady first" in our campus. They have to rush for it too!

Our dormitories are mostly mudsheds. They would certainly be swept from the ground if we had anything similar to an American hurricane. We are billeted in an army manner. Our beds are like bunks in a ship, one above the other. The floors of our dormitories are neither cemented nor floored with timber planks, just bare ground. They would not be considered sanitary or good as cowsheds in America. But, perhaps, the worst point about our dormitories is the congestion! In a room of about 100 feet by 20 feet, forty students are "chucked" in, packed like herrings in a barrel.

We don't have our tables covered with table cloths, neither do we have napkins nor comfortable chairs to sit on. Never did have! In our dining halls, or dining sheds (to be more accurate), we only have square tables, all ramshackle affairs, inclining to one side or the other, depending on which leg is weaker; and we don't have any chairs at all! We have to take our food standing up and try to make the best we can of the situation.

Definitely underfed

Our daily food is of very low caloric value. We are subsisting on a diet that is 99% vegetarian, because the price of meat is prohibitive! Our food costs $15.00[1] (national currency) a month, which is only 80¢ (American) according to the present rate of exchange. I wonder if 80¢ is sufficient to pay for a single dinner in America. Calculating on $15.00 (national currency) a month, it will mean that the food per student per day will cost 50¢—50¢ for three meals! Out of the 50¢, 40¢ goes to pay for the rice, because rice has gone up tremendously in price since the start of the war. Only 10¢ remains for vegetables to go with three meals! From this, one can gain an idea of the extent of poverty in our food. Definitely, we are underfed and it is common for students to contract diseases resulting from undernourishment.

[1]These are 1940 figures. [Ed.].

This is all caused by the poor financial position in which the majority of the students find themselves. They can't afford to pay for any better food. A great part of them come from the Japanese occupied areas, where any properties which their families have been able to build up through years of hard toil have been ruthlessly destroyed by the Japanese. Now they have to depend upon the Government. The relief is far from adequate. Thus it is really a problem for them to make ends meet. If each of them could only have 20¢ U.S. more, they would be able to eke out a humanly satisfactory life! But, alas! for them to find 20¢ U.S. is impossible. Our Government already being heavily burdened financially for the war is unfortunately not able to do anything more for them. They will still have to go on subsisting on a semi-starvation or semi-destitute basis.

Few students are well dressed, of course, and here I don't mean to imply any foolish sense. Most of the students wear long gowns made of coarse blue cloth, which is cheap as well as dirt-proof, so as to minimise laundry expenses. It is a common sight in our Campus to see students dressed in clothes patched all over like the patched rags of coolies on the wharves. Some students can only afford to have a haircut once in two months.

We have very few sports, no soccer and no tennis! We have only one basketball court and two miniature football fields for our 3,500 students. We have no college papers, and there are very few outside magazines to which our students can contribute articles. So the only avenue left for our students in which to practise their literary skill is to contribute to wall newspapers of which we have many on our Campus.

An army of bookworms

But "wartimisation" has produced at least one beneficial effect. The serious and solemn atmosphere it has cultivated is strongly conducive to diligent study. The atmosphere has made us care more for our lessons. It has produced an army of bookworms among our student body. In consequence, Lienta students are well-known for their attachment to books and Lienta is famous as a nest of budding scholars.

We are working very hard. We have very heavy class work. The students with the lightest class work have to attend at least twenty-four hours of lectures a week. Our engineering students have to do more than thirty-five hours. American students may

call this drudgery! Our heavy class work has left us with very little time for outside supplementary reading. But then we don't need to have too much time, because our poor library has very few books for us to read.

We have many dramatic societies in our college. Occasionally, they put on variety concerts, which though not very accomplished in artistic or dramatic value are a satisfactory display of histrionic talents. At least, they have relieved many of our poor students of the expenses of going to amusements in the town. These dramatic societies usually do not possess sufficient funds to purchase their paraphernalia, so sometimes they have to use blankets as curtains!

Our freshmen are required to undergo three hours' military training a week in accordance with the National Defence Scheme. Their daily life is subjected to a modified form of military discipline. But nothing is required that will unduly interfere with their studies.

Serving our country

One of our most popular war slogans is: don't forget to serve your country even in your studies. This slogan has great influence on our lives. As we are poring over our books, we, all the same, think of serving our country. When our vacations come, we group ourselves together for services to our country. Usually, we organise propaganda excursions into the villages, wherein lies the life and flows the blood of our New China. Our propaganda does not merely centre on anti-Japanism as is generally supposed, but equal emphasis is laid on soil cultivation and mass education in every possible respect.

Thus, in spite of the physical hardships and material insufficiency, our Lienta is still going strong, undaunted and undeterred! We are proud to be her students, even though to be her students means to suffer. Life may be an ordeal to us! We may not be able to enjoy life, but we can and will study, and in the long run it is knowledge that counts for a college student. We will not allow ourselves to be daunted by the possibility that our cluster of small rectangular mudsheds with all our worldly possessions in them may one day be razed to the ground by Japanese planes. We are determined to keep up our study morale, just as our comrades at the front are determined to keep up their fighting morale.

More Questions for Thinking Ahead

A message from a group of students, meeting at Présinge, near Geneva, 2nd-4th September, 1942

On this third anniversary of the outbreak of war in Europe, a small group of Christian students, representing six different countries, has been able to meet in Switzerland for a Federation conference. We are conscious of our privilege, and we should like to say to those who have not been able to join with us that we feel ourselves to be in close communion with them. We wish also to express our gratitude for the work done at Poughkeepsie,[1] which has served as a basis for our discussions. Considering the distance in space and time which separates us from Poughkeepsie, it is inevitable that we should approach some problems from a slightly different angle, but you have given our thoughts a fruitful impulse.

Our discussions have been affected by the terrible events which are taking place even while we meet. Europe is in a state of confusion and chaos which is beyond the imagination of those who have not been living in it.

Five students have prepared this document, in which they have sought especially to emphasise certain points which do not seem to them to have been adequately dealt with in the Poughkeepsie document. They hope that their comrades in other lands will help them to study these problems more deeply, and to state them more clearly.

1. *Christian ethics*

The problem of the fundamental basis of Christian ethics presents itself to us today in a very different way from that in pre-war Europe. In the occupied countries convinced Christians find themselves in situations where they are forced to recognise that the moral conceptions which have seemed sufficient till now cannot help them to solve the concrete problems which face them. The Bible does not provide us with ready-made solutions, it does not state general principles which will be applicable in every particular case; but it does give us certain indications as to what the Christian attitude must be in the face of moral conflicts. It demands of us concrete decisions. It is our duty to discern the will of God in every situation—what is in accordance with His will is the *truth*.

[1]For the report of the Poughkeepsie conference see THE STUDENT WORLD, Third Quarter, 1942.

It may happen, for example, that in order to act in conformity with the will of God revealed to us in Jesus Christ, we have in certain circumstances to tell a lie. Some of us have had to lie to save a life or to prevent another from committing a crime. Some of us who a few months ago would have shrunk from breaking the law, would do so unhesitatingly today to save a refugee.

Such examples show that good and evil are not conventional ideas or autonomous realities. Christian ethics is not based on universal laws, or on a moral idealism. It is concrete obedience to the will of God.

Question: How does the Bible help us to discern this will of God which must determine our decisions?

2. The basis of law

The problem of law is perhaps the most fundamental which faces us; what are the biblical bases of law and justice?

We see with horror on the continent of Europe today what a world without law is like. Arbitrary sentences, mass deportations, violation of the right of sanctuary—all reveal the abyss which will soon engulf a world where law exists only to serve the ends of the strongest.

The complete upheaval of the whole tradition of continental Europe, the heritage of a civilisation interpenetrated by Christianity, faces us with a problem very different from that which faces the English-speaking countries. There the already existing standards of values survive, and their concern is to keep their life at the level of those standards. But for us all the so-called Christian standards have given way in the war. In the face of a rising anarchy solid foundations must be found.

We feel that for a "post-Christian" world like Europe the consequences of the destruction of human standards of value is much more serious than for a world that has never known Christianity. There is no salvation for Europe except in a return to the very origin of those standards.

Our former conceptions of law and justice were founded on a certain natural law, a theory of the rights of man, based on a simple belief in man as good and reasonable. Experience has shown how idealistic this conception was. Our task now is to seek what guiding lines are given us in the Bible—we think for example of the rights of foreigners in the Old Testament. There is no question there of a system, but of a word to which man must continually listen.

Question: What, in your opinion, are the biblical bases of law? Discuss the conception of natural law.

3. *Truth*

Another grave problem which faces us is the devaluation of the idea of truth. Truth is becoming for many people, a subjective conception which varies according to nation, class, or race. The question now is how to maintain or to rediscover in every university discipline the will to seek truth objectively, a will which is independent of all factors foreign to this discipline. The very existence of the university is at stake in this question.

For Christians, the question is how to find the connection between Truth, as the Word of God, and truth as the object of human research.

Question: In what does the search for truth consist for the Christian member of a university? Is his search different from that of a non-Christian?

4. *Judgment*

This war is a judgment pronounced upon the whole world, upon the Church, and upon every Christian. Nothing could be more tragic than that Christians and the Church should remain after the war what they were before. The judgment of God always comes upon us in the present, and calls us to repentance and to definite obedience.

We must take care not to seek to escape from this judgment by hiding ourselves in plans for the future, and by building an imaginary new order for after the war.

There is a danger that we may dream of a future state governed by Christian principles, and not listen to the word that God wants to say to us today, with all the immediate and concrete necessities which result from it.

Question: In what respects do present events appear like a judgment (1) on the world; (2) on the Church; (3) on our S.C.M.?

5. *Nationalism*

The peoples are engaged today in a struggle for existence, and they are in danger of seeing only the biological aspect of the struggle, of losing the sense of their own mission, of losing their souls. The nation is not a social group due to chance. It is God who calls the nations into existence, and gives to them their dignity and their tasks. We are inclined to lay too much emphasis on, and to overestimate, our national and political individuality. This attitude is opposed to the ecumenical Christian conception. In the occupied countries which are suffering under foreign domination this danger is particularly acute, as the concepts of political and Christian freedom tend to be the two sides of one and the same problem, and so are liable to be identified one with the other.

Question: How can the right relation be established between our ecumenical calling and our national calling, between the concern we have as Christians for the good of all peoples, and our particular responsibility for our own people?

6. *Human suffering*

Certain countries today are undergoing sufferings which can scarcely be imagined or conceived by those who are not exposed to them. When these sufferings are accepted as a trial sent by God (Hebrews 12: 11) they have a purifying effect. We have seen Christian churches fortified and purified by persecution. We have even seen nations without any Christian faith attaining, in the crucible of suffering, a quite new unity and solidarity. In this connection too we may speak of the purifying effect of suffering.

It is obvious however that suffering does not necessarily bring us nearer God. On the contrary we know that it can produce a terrible hardening of heart. The most terrible thing in the crisis through which Europe is passing is that this suffering seems to be so meaningless. We see young people today who have lost any sense of the value of human life.

We realise that the future will depend very largely on the fruits of the present suffering. We see too that the different reactions to this suffering will make mutual understanding very difficult. Those who have suffered most will have first right when the moment comes to rebuild Europe.

Question: How can we ourselves discover, and help others to see the blessing hidden in suffering? Is it possible for us to make ourselves interpreters of the suffering of other groups or other nations, and so to help towards mutual understanding?

7. *Hatred*

The horrors of the occupation, and the still worse horror of divisions within our countries bring us to a more realistic understanding of the commandment to love our enemies. We cannot hope to prevent the outbursts of hatred which will take place after the war against traitors to their countries or against the occupying forces.

The question arises therefore whether we have a right to hate our enemies. We cannot disembody evil. The Old Testament speaks violently of the enemies of God, and says of them that they are hated, and that the psalmist prays for their destruction. Yet the Bible reminds us that it is the sin which is hated, not the sinner. We cannot hate a human being.

The difficulty is that we are often tempted to consider our personal enemies as God's enemies. The violence of war tends to give predominance to the instinctive reactions and the emotional uprisings of hatred within us. Our spirit must therefore without ceasing control these reactions and a purification of our emotional reactions becomes more than ever necessary. It is only the will for justice that can authorise us to ask God to destroy His enemies.

On the other hand the real community of the Universal Church to which men of all countries belong does not allow us to think of a post-war settlement in which any country whatever shall be shut out from the international community.

Question: Is it the right or even the duty of a Christian to have enemies? Can these enemies be other than God's enemies? How can they be recognised?

8. *The Jewish question*

During the days we spent at Présinge we were once again led to concentrate our thoughts and our prayers in a very special way on the Jewish people. We knew indeed that at the very time we were meeting mass deportations were taking place in several countries. These measures, among the most appalling of the war, call forth all the love of one's neighbour and of humanity, which are left in the world. The Jewish question is especially important for still other reasons to the Christian Church. For the Jewish people, dispersed throughout the world, is a sign from God, and holds a unique place among the nations. God Himself gave it this place, for it was to the Jews that, after the Fall, God gave the promise that to them should be born the Saviour. In spite of the faithlessness into which the people of the promise often fell, God kept His word, and Jesus was born to the Jews. The Jews did not recognise in Him the Saviour, and the Christian Church was called to proclaim the promises of God. But Israel's rôle was not at an end because of this fact. God still has a plan for this people, and anyone who touches the Jews interferes in God's dealings with His people, and claims to be solving a problem the solution of which God has, in reality, kept for Himself.

The Christian Church opposes anti-semitism as it is bound to oppose oppression of any group of people by another (cf. oppression of coloured peoples by white) but it opposes anti-semitism particularly, on account of the special relation existing between the Jewish people and the Christian Church.

Question: What, according to the word of God (note Romans 11) is the special relation between the Jewish people and the Christian Church? What are the practical consequences of this relation

in so far as the personal attitude of the Christian to the Jews is concerned both on the plane of personal relationships and on the political plane?

Our last word about Europe today is not however only confusion and uncertainty. We see Christians and Christian churches bravely taking their stand and confessing their faith in Him Whose Kingdom is not of this world.

Our time is in dire need of prophets. We believe that today as in other times of crisis God has a prophetic message "for this generation" and that He is seeking instruments, men who will have the courage to stand alone against the world if need be like Amos or Jeremiah, to proclaim His judgments and His salvation to a world in distress. We would prepare ourselves for the coming of these prophets in a spirit of prayer, of expectancy, and of obedience. Perhaps it may be to one or other of us, Christian students of this generation, that the word of the Lord will come with an irresistible power.

"Behold, I make all things new." (Rev. 21: 5.)

(These questions should be regarded as supplementary to the questions which appeared in the Third Quarter, 1942. The Third one on *Truth* is closely related to this issue of THE STUDENT WORLD. The Sixth one on *Suffering* is strikingly similar to the theme of the Call for the Universal Day of Prayer for Students. Some of the other questions will be the bases of articles in the Second Quarter, 1943.—Ed.)

Call for the Observance of the Universal Day of Prayer for Students

Sunday, 21st February, 1943

"WHO SHALL SEPARATE US FROM THE LOVE OF CHRIST? SHALL TRIBULATION, OR DISTRESS, OR PERSECUTION, OR FAMINE, OR NAKEDNESS, OR PERIL, OR SWORD?" Romans 8: 35.

These words of St. Paul reflect his own experience and that of the first Christians. They speak to us of the different ways in which suffering may meet a Christian, force him down into the deepest distress in life—doubt in the goodness of God, and make his heart hard and insensible. Suffering is always a serious temptation to desertion from the way of love and kindness. Very often it throws man back on himself and closes his eyes and heart to the needs and distress of his neighbour, making him concentrate on his own suffering, so that he does not see anything really but himself. All others, his neighbours, disappear out of sight.

Suffering is one of the most dangerous forces in life. Jesus Christ was once promised power and glory by the devil, if He fell down and worshipped him. When the Steadfast One did not yield to the temptation of earthly happiness, the tempter turned to disaster and suffering. This was his most dangerous weapon and the Lord was led into the most difficult temptation of His life. But He stood upright, He kept His fellowship with the Father unbroken and endured in obedience to the will of God and in love for a sinful and unhappy humanity.

Believing in Him, Who won His victory in temptation and hard suffering, St. Paul could write to his Christian brethren: What shall separate us from the love of Christ? . . . In Christian history we often meet people who in their lives are witnesses to the power and the certainty of faith, expressed in these words of the apostle.

In our own time they are miraculously relevant. Firstly as a description of the distress and the agony that evil insanity has spread over Christendom and humanity. Tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, sword—with these words the word of God describes our own time, filled to the brim with suffering. For those who are placed in the midst of this suffering, the temptation is great

and strong to be swept away by other forces in life than the spirit of Christ. And yet these other forces, which try to break down Christian faith and order, are not the most dangerous. Above all we have to fear, and arm ourselves against, this nameless suffering, which creates doubt in the love of God, removes us from our neighbours and prepares the ground for the idols of this age. Also to those who stand outside the present war the sight of the suffering of others is a mighty temptation to desert the God Whom Jesus called Father.

Has this unbelievable suffering separated us from the love of Christ? In the midst of it and often through it we meet our Saviour with His mercy which supports and raises us. The Patient One imparts to us His patience, the Faithful One His faithfulness, and the Merciful One His mercy. Only through Him we reach the world of kindness, only in Him we have power to resist the temptation of suffering. At this time it is especially important that Christians should be united in the strong convictions which the apostle has expressed in these words.

Christian students have been brought into solitude and isolation. Barriers have been raised between countries and peoples, hindering personal fellowship and mutual conversation, which should edify and strengthen the Christian life and be of use to the Kingdom of God. Hands that want to do the deeds of love are forced to bear weapons. The world is traversed by different frontiers. But there is one unseen frontier which we must hold, on the right side of which we must take our stand: the frontier of love against the assault of suffering. Here all those who have experienced the love of Christ are united. They have their fellowship in this love, although it cannot be expressed just now, except through prayer. Let us on this day of prayer ask our Heavenly Father for faith, steadfast in the trial of suffering; for love, growing out of our meeting with Christ, from Whom no earthly suffering has the power to part us; and for hope, pointing to us a future, where Christian students may once more be able to meet in a recovered world. And let us pray for our suffering brethren that their suffering may become a suffering in fellowship with our Saviour.

The Officers of the
World's Student Christian Federation.

Studies in the Fourth Gospel

Richard Roberts

Second Series

SIN, SALVATION AND ETERNAL LIFE

I.

In a little book recently published, Dr. Charles Raven says that in Christian Doctrine we start not with *sin* but with *God*. The initiated well understand that this is a tilt at another theologian, no less well-known, whose preoccupation with sin has been a fertile field of discussion for some time past. Into this debate I will not enter here beyond remarking that apart from the postulate of a righteous God, theologically there cannot be any meaning in the word *sin*. It is however not without interest to observe that only one New Testament book begins with the Word God, namely the Epistle to the Hebrews. But the Fourth Gospel comes a close second: "In the beginning was the Word," the Logos; and the name of God comes in the next clause: "And the Word was with God." But the word *sin* the author of the Gospel appears to shun as much as he can. Its first appearance is in 1: 29—"Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." It does not occur again until the eighth chapter; and in the form of the single noun, it only occurs six times in the whole Gospel. As a verb, it occurs even less. But this does not mean that there are no other allusions to the thing *Sin*. Here is an instance: "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." (3: 19.) Here is essential sin,—the repudiation of the light that came by Jesus Christ.

But we are not to assume that an evil deed is *per se* sin. An evil deed done in ignorance is still an evil deed, and it is not to be accounted as sin. "If ye were blind," said Jesus to a company of Pharisees, "ye should have no sin." If they knew no better, they were rather to be pitied. But the Pharisees boasted of their light, even their monopoly of light; and therefore, as Jesus said, their sin remained. To persist in refusing to see the light is not only sin, it is the unpardonable sin, the sin of putting out one's own moral eyes (9: 41). At least twice more, Jesus stressed the point: "If I had not come and spoken to them they had not had sin; but now they

have no cloak for their sin." (15: 22.) "If I had not done among them the works that no other man had done, they had not had sin." (15: 24.) Neither His words nor His works moved them. To love darkness rather than light is the essence of sin; to persist in it in the face of the light is the capital sin, the sin that cannot be forgiven.

The words *judgment* and *condemnation* which occur frequently in this connection in the Fourth Gospel are both alike a translation of the same Greek word, *krisis,* which has domesticated itself in English speech as *crisis.* In our use of it, it signifies a grave emergency, in which serious decisions are called for. In the Greek, it was a word of considerable elasticity. According to Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, it may stand for a separating, a choice, a deciding, a judgment, a sentence, a trial, a quarrel. In its adjectival form in English usage, it has some of its original elasticity; it may be used to designate the intention of an editorial or a literary essay. It may also be used to describe a dangerous moment in the course of a fever. In the Fourth Gospel it refers indifferently to judgment and condemnation; and we have to infer its precise meaning, when it occurs in the text, from the context. Here is an instance of how James Moffatt overcomes the difficulty of distinguishing between the two uses of the word: "God did not send his Son into the world to pass sentence upon it, but to save the world by him. He who believes in him is not sentenced; he who will not believe is sentenced already, for having refused to believe in the name of the only Son of God. And this is the sentence of condemnation, that the Light has entered the world and yet men have preferred darkness to light." (3: 17, 18, 19a.)

However, it serves little purpose to discriminate between legal terms in this context. For the actual issue here is not an affair of legal justice or the vindication of law. It is rather the question of man's relation to God, and therefore to Jesus, the incarnate Son of God, and this is an affair of life and death, and not only of time, but also of eternity. The order of Law, by the very coming of Jesus, had been superseded by the order of Grace and Truth. The evangelist makes it clear that the Incarnate Word had not come into the world as a Judge but as a Saviour; and he who accepts Him goes free. He who rejects Him passes judgment upon himself by the very act. It is not necessary to bring to judgment the man who refuses to believe in the Only Begotten Son of the Father. By his refusal, he puts himself beyond the pale of Life.

II.

It was, however, to a law-ridden world that Jesus had come. In Palestine two great systems of law stood over against one another, the Law of Moses and the Law of Rome. The conquered people, and particularly, their leaders left no expedient idle that might serve

to secure the survival of the Mosaic code. But Jesus had no illusions about the limitations of Jewish law,—both the code and the glosses upon it which had multiplied through the years by the industry of the professional lawyers. One notable tract of his teaching is concerned with demonstrating the inherent but unrecognised implications of certain points of the Mosaic code. For instance,

> "Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne; Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." (Matt. 5: 33-37.)

That is to say, there cannot be a double standard (much less a multiple standard) of truth,—sworn truth and unsworn. For a double standard of truth undermines the purposes of speech, which is the main organ in creating and nourishing fellowship. A society in which truth is regarded lightly is inviting disintegration and destruction.

But in a society which was under a rule of religious legalism, it was not possible to avoid controversy especially when the letter of the law was sacrosanct; and those Hebrew fundamentalists, the Pharisees, gave Jesus no peace. So He had to deal with them in their own coin and speak to them in their idiom. If they wanted to argue in terms of the Law, and speak of judgment and condemnation, so be it. By virtue of His divine Sonship, He was also the Judge and all judgment was committed to Him (5: 22). Nor was it a delegated office; it was inherent in His Sonship. "The Father hath given to the Son to have life in himself" (5: 26), that is to say, the Son is autonomous; and by virtue of His autonomy, He has "authority to execute judgment" (5: 27). But this authority is inherent in Him also because He is the Son of man no less than He is the Son of God. He is, so to speak, the supremely representative Man, the embodiment of ideal manhood, yet a man among men. There seems to be a suggestion here that the Eternal Logos is too far from men to enable Him to judge the human sinner. But, as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, the Incarnate Logos is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, having been tempted in all points as we are, yet without sin (Heb. 4: 15). Nor is it on this ground alone that the Son is competent to judge us. "My judgment is just, because I do not seek my own will." (5: 30.) He is the only perfectly disinterested judge, for His will is gathered up into the will

of His Father, so that when He judges, it is not his own verdict that He renders. "As I hear, I judge," that is to say, I pronounce the verdict which My Father puts into My mouth (5: 30). It is difficult to reconcile this saying with a previous one: "The Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment to the Son" (5: 22); and this is by no means the only instance of contradictory statement in the Gospel.

But the author of the Gospel is actually attempting a task beyond the capacity of a man however inspired. He is trying to describe a life lived in two dimensions simultaneously. He accepts the truth of the incarnation and the implications of his own saying, "The Word became flesh", and sets out to write the biography of a person in two dimensions, *time* and *eternity*. From the nature of the case such a story must be full of paradoxes and apparent contradictions. Here we have the source of the main difficulties of this Gospel. What, for instance, is a simple reader to make of this passage in which there is only one word of more than two syllables: "Ye judge according to the flesh; I judge no man; and yet, if I judge, my judgment is true, for I am not alone; but I and the Father that sent me."? There are many passages of like difficulty in this Gospel. Of such passages, we should assume that they belong to a dimension of spiritual insight with which most of us are unacquainted; and we must be content to make of them, with the measure and quality of insight which have been given to us, what we can. This does not necessarily mean that this condition is permanent. On the contrary, it is possible for a man who has not sworn his soul away to rise, by the sedulous "practice of the presence of God", to a level of spiritual insight that may transfigure his world, and put him at ease in the company of the author of the Fourth Gospel and his like. This was the world of light and life which Jesus came to open to all believers. But few of us cross that threshold.

III.

Over against sin, there is salvation. This is announced at the beginning of the Gospel. The Baptist speaks of Jesus as having come to take away the sin of the world; and Jesus Himself at a later time declared that He had not come to judge the world but to save it (12: 47). But of anything comparable to what our forefathers called "the plan of salvation" there is hardly a trace. Some of the great words of the Synoptic Gospels in this context, for instance, *forgiveness* and *repentance* do not appear in the Fourth. Even the word *grace* does not appear after the Prologue; and nowhere is there a direct statement of the meaning of the words *save* and *salvation*. They are left to tell their own tale. We derive the words from the Latin. When a Roman was setting out on a

journey, his friends would say to him, *Salve!* which we in our idiom would render: "A good time to you!" The corresponding Greek word was similarly used as a general greeting at meeting or parting. But when these words were used among Christians, they signified other and deeper things,—in particular, spiritual security and well being, even in a world which hated and despised them. Already they knew themselves to be saved. Not indeed that they should have an easy time. On the contrary, Jesus warns them of difficult times:

> "Behold the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone. Yet I am not alone because the Father is with me. These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer. I have overcome the world." (16: 32-33.)

But that was not the end of the story. Of that, Jesus had spoken on an earlier occasion:

> "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God; believe also in me. In my Father's house there are many mansions. If it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you; and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." (14: 1-2.)

The peak of salvation is *eternal life*. The word *everlasting* is occasionally used as an alternative to *eternal* in the Authorised Version. But whether there is a definite principle governing the alternation does not appear. The concept of eternity stands in antithesis to *time,* at least to measurable time. Time as we know it will disappear with the last man, when this world's day is done. But what the alternative to time is, or whether there be such an alternative, we cannot *know*. That there is something somewhere, where life persists is implied in the Christian doctrine of Immortality. Jesus certainly believed it to be so, for He gives it a name, *"my Father's house"*. Moreover, that man may attain to life beyond death is at least a reasonable inference from the persistence of the habit of *prayer* which, however crude it be, may reasonably be regarded as the expression of an instinctive *élan* towards an existence beyond "this bourne of time and space". It has been said that "if the religious instincts of humanity do not point to a reality as their object, they are out of analogy with other instinctive endowments". For the present, as another John has put it, "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He appeareth, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." (I John 3: 2.)

But while we may not know now what eternal life is, we may know something of the way into it. The writer of the Fourth Gospel has much to say about it; but we can here only notice the most significant points:

1. *Faith* (3: 16). This is probably the most widely known and loved passage in Holy Writ. Just here, however, we are concerned only with one word in it, namely *"believeth"*. Here it figures as the way to eternal life. Faith is an act of the will, evoked by a conviction; it persists as an attitude of the whole person, an attitude frequently renewed by continual affirmations of the conviction. This conviction is that Jesus is the Christ, the Saviour of the world.

2. *Work* (4: 31-36). The Work is that of leading men to God through Jesus Christ, and of seizing every opportunity of doing so. "Lift up your eyes and look upon the fields, for they are white already to harvest. And he that reapeth, receiveth wages and gathereth fruit unto life eternal." The saving of souls is the vocation of all Christians—a vocation, however, honoured more by the breach than by the performance in contemporary Christendom.

3. *Fellowship* (6: 54). "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life." This strong, even violent figure of speech is intended to indicate the intensity of the fellowship into which the Son of man calls His followers and looks for from them. They are called to live in such intimacy with Him, and He with them, that they, as it were, so absorb Him and become assimilated to him that they and He are virtually a single organism, with one mind and purpose. This relation to the living Christ is also a rarity in modern Christendom.

4. *Sustenance* (6: 33-35; 7: 37). Jesus declares Himself to be food and drink to them who follow Him. They shall neither hunger nor thirst. What food and drink do for the body, the living Christ does for the soul,—He keeps it in health and strength.

A LETTER FROM THE EDITOR TO HIS FRIENDS IN EUROPE

Two full years have passed since I crossed the Atlantic from Europe. They have not been stationary years, for I have visited students in eight countries and hundreds of colleges, from New York to Buenos Aires, from Santiago-de-Chile to San Francisco, from Vancouver to Halifax, from Winnipeg to Mexico City! No month has passed without letters and documents from Europe, to keep me in touch with you; and I am still introduced as "a visitor from Geneva"! I have made innumerable speeches about students in Europe, some of which might have caused you amusement or irritation; none, I hope, anger. But all the time I have felt I was an exile, not so much because I did not return to Europe, as because I could not. If absence makes the heart grow fonder, affection is certainly increased when absence is enforced. Now as I wait day by day for a passage to my own country—in a queer "debateable land" of the mind between two continents—I should like to share with you some reflections in a letter to reach you for the Day of Prayer for Students, the only action in our fellowship we may still call universal.

American students have a habit of referring to "war-torn Europe", as if it were an historical and geographical phenomenon remote from their experience; and in a sense it is so. You say yourselves in the message from the meeting at Présinge: "The complete upheaval of the whole tradition of continental Europe, the heritage of a civilisation interpenetrated by Christianity, faces us with a problem very different from that which faces English-speaking countries." It is impossible for us to imagine what your European experience is like, with the very ground of your tradition heaving beneath your feet. Yet the problem which faces North American students, though different, is intimately related to yours. They know now that an eruption in Europe, or the Far East, is a symptom of a general thinness of the crust of civilisation. They never believed that this was so, and now they are being transported all over the world to prevent further eruptions, like men putting out fire with their hands. It is very difficult to be involved in a great crisis of mankind of which you have no first-hand knowledge, to fight a war because it must *be fought rather than because of what has happened to your country.*

The difference between the problems we face is clearly brought out in the questions we ask. You remember the questions raised at the Poughkeepsie meeting earlier this year? It is interesting to look at them in relation to the questions in the message from Présinge. Yours on the whole are moral questions, asked from the inside, ours on the whole are political questions, asked from the outside; your questions have their main bearing on the present, ours on the future. Yet these two sets of questions are not in opposition, they are complementary. The questions from the outside are meaningless unless those from the inside are being asked; some of the questions from the inside can find no answers unless those from the outside are answered first. The emphasis of English-speaking students on social and political problems, and plans for their solution, does not mean an absence of moral interest; rather it springs from the conviction that some of the supreme moral problems of the day are on the political level. But your dealing in plain terms, like lies and anarchy, suffering and hate, is a most salutary corrective. American students are apt to go off into a queer incantation of great, sweeping phrases, and the progress of evil is never in any way arrested by such means. Yet perhaps the desire on this side of the Atlantic to discuss the rebuilding of order in the world will remind you that it is as well to have some pattern to which we are working as Christians, if we are to face our immediate problems with courage and initiative.

The most wonderful thing to my mind is that in our thought and conversation we are so conscious of one another. The messages from Poughkeepsie and Présinge both begin with expressions of community in spite of distances, and barriers of war. We realise at once that it is not our experience of war and disaster which unites us, but our experience of Christ. As we face our problems, different as they may be, we are together learning more of Him. The profound change in the statements of their faith made by groups of American students in recent years is not simply a change in words, nor a by-product of a war situation; it betokens a fuller understanding of Jesus Christ. As I have visited the new student Christian movements in Latin American countries I have been struck with the desire to study the New Testament, not only because it would help their members in their daily life, but because it would strengthen their eventual contribution as movements to the whole Federation. Further, all that has happened to Christians in Europe, and in the Far East, has never primarily attracted sympathy; it has always constituted first and foremost a witness to their Lord. You have no conception how deeply the life of the movements in Canada and the States has been affected in this way.

I do not suggest that this new experience of Christ is a matter of personal piety alone. It is of course strictly relevant to the kind of study which THE STUDENT WORLD *has been seeking to encourage. We have to think ahead very practically for the future, but we have to do so* as Christians. *As never before we have an opportunity of doing this, of turning Christian faith into intelligent moral action, just because our principal medium of common understanding is not political or social, but religious. Christians not only have a peculiar obligation in times like these to think realistically about the future, they also have a flying start. We can talk with one another, while the secular world has no language it can use. Our interchange of questions between North America and Europe may not seem very epoch-making, but there is not much taking place that rivals it. Perhaps the very fact that we do not try to make up our minds alone as national groups, or as united nations' groups, is the first step towards a Christian view of the world.*

Our Swedish friends, to whom we owe the Call to Prayer this year, have most movingly drawn attention, as one of the Présinge questions has done, to the fact of human suffering. My task on this continent has been to try to interpret suffering, such as I have not experienced, to others who can scarcely imagine it. The temptation for Christians outside Europe and outside the Far Eastern conflict, is to lay emphasis on all the nobler aspects and results of suffering, and so to avoid its full impact. This challenge from inside is therefore good for us. Yet the more terrible suffering is, the more Christians must seek to save others from its most lasting effects. I should like to say that the effort on the part of student leaders on this continent to raise money for the relief of suffering amongst students in China and in Europe, indeed wherever they can be reached, is based on a genuine desire to associate themselves with suffering. Much giving of money is of course superficial but, as I have gone from campus to campus speaking for "the fund", I have again and again been made aware that the reality which could compel men was not any fund, but the Federation behind it. Indeed the fault of the North American student is that he is apt to think you are *the Federation, while he is somehow on the outside. His misfortune is that he belongs to a nation that has never been conscious of needing any help. The American Christian student is becoming aware of his loneliness, and his helplessness. As he too enters in increasing measure into that area of suffering, where you have been before him, he will feel more than ever part of the Federation.*

And in the years ahead you will need him as badly as he will need you. He has lost his confidence in some of his ideals for the world, but not his confidence in the future. As he goes to war, he goes that he may meet you some day. The World Christian Youth Con-

ference in Amsterdam in 1939 marked for him, as for you, a long step forward in relationships. When you meet again some day you will be nearer and not farther apart. War divides men most evilly, but in so far as it sends Christians back to their deepest loyalty to Jesus Christ, it makes them more aware of one another as members of His family.

And so, if for two years I have been an exile, I have also been at home. The Federation may have a headquarters in Geneva, and its general secretary may have temporary addresses in New York and Toronto, but none of these indications can locate it. The Federation lives in the minds and hearts of men and women in an astonishing variety of places and circumstances. As you and I remember it in our prayers, we know assuredly that it rests also in the mind and heart of God, and that is the only guarantee we need for deeper understanding, for future meeting, and for constructive work ahead.

R. C. M.

THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

An Australian View of the Religion of the Soldier

The Army is a unique laboratory for research into social and religious questions. The "uniforming" of almost a complete cross-section of society and their segregation into a single controlled group makes possible a close examination of the beliefs and thoughts of an entire generation of men, and to a lesser extent of women. If the leaders of the Christian Church wish to discover what, apart from convention, are the faiths and standards men really live by, what are the strengths and weaknesses of men in their "natural" state, what is their thought on God, life, death and immortality, then here is the chance to make that discovery. Here, too, we can learn of their criticism of the social order and of the Church, their conceptions of the Christian religion, their thoughts about Jesus Christ, the type of social and religious movement that wins their sympathy and support.

Such an enquiry demands both the attention and participation of the Student Christian Movement, both as a service to the Church and as a direct and essential part of its own work. . . . What, then, are the soldier's beliefs and thoughts on religious and ethical questions? (A different question, of course, from the absorbing, if ticklish, one of the official Army attitude to religion.)

Life and Doctrine

The men meet "religion" principally (and often almost exclusively) in the person of the Padre (for they rarely associate the work of the Red Cross or the Y.M.C.A. with religion) and on the church parade. In most large units church parades are compulsory, though frequently there is some slight reluctance on the part of C.O.'s to insist on their being held. The attitude of the great bulk of the men to church parade is determined by the respect or otherwise they have for the Padre conducting it. A pious, artificial or "phoney" chaplain will be drowned out with coughing or talking *sotto voce;* a man who has a plain message and who is himself "doing a job" will get as eager an audience as any man could desire—though an audience sometimes a little mystified by

the "unreality" of ecclesiastical formulas and practices. For, broadly speaking, the men have little or no understanding of the doctrinal side of Christianity—such phrases as "the Kingdom of God", "the presence of the Holy Spirit", "the Church Universal", are entirely without meaning; yet they have a real understanding of the inner ethic of active goodwill, limited though this goodwill be to their own class and race. The average Australian soldier has a vague, elementary belief in God; he has some sort of religion, though it falls short of being Christian at many points. The one time when it may come to the surface in more or less articulate expression is when a man is face to face with death and an almost instinctive prayer for safety breaks from his lips. It is unwise to place too great significance on this well-attested phenomenon, but it does suggest that in the presence of the most terrific display of material force that human history has ever seen, men believe that there is an Unseen Power, inaccessible to the senses, which is yet mightier than high explosives and in whose hands are all the issues of life and death.

But withal this religion is desperately in need of educating and Christianising. "The religion of 90% of the men in the Army is not distinctly Christian, but a religion of patriotism and valour, tinged with chivalry, and at the best merely coloured with sentiment and emotion borrowed from Christianity." In the unit with which I am most familiar, about 10% go to church (as distinct from church parade) voluntarily and with regularity, while for about 5% their Christian faith is a conscious, empowering, vitalising experience to them, producing a quality of life respected and appreciated by officers and men alike. To the vast majority, then, God is an ill-defined and distant Omnipotence, almost totally unrelated to every-day life.

The subject of a future life is, strangely, rarely discussed, though one has the impression that it is pressing on the subconscious continuously. For men face to face with the possibility of death by mutilation or incineration in a tank, or in equally unpleasant ways, some sort of terms have to be made with death if the future is not to be too unnerving. The usual compromise takes the form of a fatalism, deriving not from any intellectual conviction but from practical necessity. This fatalism is always tinged with the hope that "it mightn't be me" and that "perhaps it won't be the end after all". There is practically no belief in the Christian doctrine of resurrection (mainly, one feels, for lack of adequate exposition), and no thought that death may mean the beginning of future service with fuller scope and better instruments of expression (probably because few men consider the purpose of this life to be the service of others). There is often expressed, though I

doubt if it is seriously believed, the vague suggestion that death in battle for one's country will ensure an immortality in a (presumably) nationalistic Valhalla.

On all these great questions of life and death there is a crying need for constant, simple, convinced Christian teaching, to which a profound and ready response will be found.

Christ and His Church

A subject of the highest importance in this enquiry is the attitude of the men to the person of Jesus Christ. There is a curious duality of attitude to Him. The constant blasphemous use of His name implies an unconscious recognition of His central significance. Men use His name to give weight to their words because it has some mystic potency. But the Jesus Christ spoken of by the Chaplain is a figure for whom they have the deepest respect, occasionally quoting (or misquoting) His words as an authoritative and final answer in discussion. Their conception is too often coloured by the sentimental and unheroic picture of Him acquired in their childhood or conveyed by poor religious literature. There is a vague feeling of uneasiness about His miracles, a very real and deep understanding of the Cross as self-sacrifice for others, though little understanding of it as revealing the nature of God or giving a clue to history. The Living Christ, working through the Holy Spirit, is practically unknown, and the connection of Christ and God remains an unsolved mystery. There is certainly no hostility to Jesus as an historic figure, though equally there is no general appropriation of His life-giving power. Christ the Master of men, of life and of death—this we must preach and live, for the true gospel most certainly has not lost its vitality.

With this lack of understanding of Jesus one can but expect little appreciation of the nature and reality of the Church. . . . It has lost its intellectual hold on men, largely because it fails to deal with realities; Church services often seem unnatural, denominational strife undignified, preaching disfigured by cant and compromise. Much of this criticism, it must be admitted, is based on ignorance and is an excuse rather than a reason for lack of interest. To a number of men, the churches in the towns where they may have been stationed have been a real home, the one institution (apart from the pubs.) where they have found a welcome, and one of the few real sources of inspiration in their lives. In short, men demand simplicity and honesty in religion. They readily distinguish between real and conventional Christianity, generally taking it at its conventional valuation, but readily embracing it when it strikes a note of reality and when it displays active goodwill.

What are we fighting for?

It has come as rather a shock to me personally to discover how very little thinking has been done on the real issues of the war and how deep the reluctance to do it. The only generally held motivation for fighting is to save this country from the "bloody little Japs". Not a single officer or other-ranker with whom I have discussed the matter has considered we are fighting for any "principles"—least of all democratic principles. These latter are suspect by officers as prejudicial to discipline and used by the men too often as excuses for irresponsibility. There is here a deep and urgent need for education along the lines of our too little understood "legal consciousness", if we are to avoid a rift between the civil exponents of war aims and the actual convictions of the fighting forces. The place of Christianity as the foundation stone of democracy needs constant reiteration and exposition, for where are we if men actually doing the fighting not only fail to appreciate, but deliberately repudiate the things we fondly declare are the objectives of their sacrificial effort?

War and Morality

What has been the impact of the war on morality? There is, of course, a complete shift of moral standards when men pass from civilian to military life. Concepts of right and wrong in the realm of property, sex, language, discipline, are radically modified. The basic consideration in the Army—efficiency in performing military duty—becomes the sole criterion of conduct. This imposes several restraints on men's freedom and the pressure of this discipline forces men to seek outlets in ways not frowned on by the Army—sex and language notably. The general "hardening process" is both soul-destroying and soul-creating. Military life undoubtedly kills a great deal of mental and spiritual initiative. It is a sad paradox that the men who are prepared to give the best years of their life and possibly life itself for a cause, rarely exert the mental effort to read a substantial article or book on the issues for which they are jeopardizing their lives. "Pix" is the main literary food in camps, though well-presented talks on serious subjects do get a substantial response. There is both a light and a dark side to this question of the moral impact of military life. On the one hand we have a craving for self-indulgent activities when home restraints are loosened, offset by a development of self-respect in dress and carriage, a greater variety in life through travel. An intensified nationalism is compensated for by the education travel brings. The process of learning to kill men goes on side by side with the development of a magnificent sense of comradeship. A cheerful-

ness under hardship, a devotion to duty, an unselfishness, a courage, a sincerity and a humility are strangely intermixed with a crudeness, a profanity, and an immorality which, after all, is typical of the strange creature "man" seen in his moral nakedness.

Finally, it is worthy of note that the men are very responsive to the suggestion that there are things they can *live* for as well as die for, that there is a task ahead of them in peace as in war. Planning a better Australia they see to be their task if and when they get through the present all-absorbing business. The appeal of the comprehensive ideal we have come to see in the W.S.C.F. is strong here. The story of Christian missionary activity, told as the record of a great crusade for the betterment of backward peoples through education, medicine, and faith, is a story to which they thrill because they have something of the ardour of crusaders (however much it may be knocked out of them by the monotony or harshness of war). We can and must put the Federation concept continually before men, for it comes to many as a real light through the thick darkness of the future. Some are suspect of it—it savours too much of a betrayal of their basic loyalty, patriotism—but once let them understand that it is the fine flower of true patriotism and no denial of it, then the idea grips.

This analysis of the religion of the fighting man may appear to be a gloomy picture. But there are two things that should be said by way of balancing the judgment: first, that we can hardly expect the average Australian youth to be religious when the trend of our educational and social life lacks Christian content—it is not the soldier's fault as such, he is a symptom not a cause; and secondly —and this is important—whatever his outward faith, the Australian soldier, trained, experienced, and disciplined (not the raw and callow youth caught off his balance), is in every way a *man,* for whom I personally am developing the greatest respect and, as time goes on, a deep affection. At his best (and he is often there) he is a quiet, solid, dependable, hard-working, self-respecting, soft-spoken, reverent man. The ill-disciplined, rowdy youngsters are the raw material—for them much must be done, and there is our job. Give him a knowledge of the issues at stake, give him a faith that will bring poise and self-respect, give him a vision of a world community to work for, give him healthy recreation, interesting educational material, clean society and, above all, the incessant inspiration of a fellowship with the Master of men, and out of the maelstrom of war will emerge one who speaks and acts with authority and nobility. But how much we have to do in this process and how weak our efforts to date!

J. C Alexander.

BOOK REVIEWS

TWENTY-ONE YEARS A-BUILDING. By E. A. Dale. Student Christian Movement of Canada.

Recueillir pour mieux sauter is the spirit behind this short account of the Student Christian Movement of Canada. Only a brief period has elapsed since the beginning of the organisation, but through the pages are glimpses of how deeply the work and the fellowship have become rooted in the universities of Canada. Ahead of the Movement lies a long future, because the foundations have been so solidly built. Students have made these foundations; they have created and owned the structure which now lives as a testimonial to their workmanship. Between the lines are unrecorded stories of small committees working hard and long, student leadership, difficult decisions, sacrifice. From the speech of the student who had been in prison in Germany in the 1914-1918 war at the first conference to the lines of *Poisoning the Student Mind*—printed in full at the close of the leaflet—everything seems indigenous to student soil. Effective use has been made of articles by students published in the *Canadian Student,* and through their opinions, blunt and honest, the course of growth is traced.

Especially interesting is the nice degree of balance between theory and practice, belief and action. On the one hand there is the importance of the "Records" study groups, central in all the twenty-one years; on the other hand variety of action, from the student delegation sent to Ottawa about Disarmament to the holding of the conference on national issues in recent years. Another characteristic is the constant awareness of membership in the "Larger Fellowship", especially in the World's Student Christian Federation. The Movement was affiliated with the Federation from the beginning, and steps have constantly been taken to make it world-minded. A prominent place has always been given to the participation of students from other countries in the conferences.

Writing this review from across the boundary between Canada and the States, it must be said how much there is to covet for the United States Student Christian Movement in the spirit and experience of the Canadian Movement. Apart from such full participation of Canadian students as took place at the Des Moines conference of the Student Volunteer Movement in 1919, there is little to show for

the impact of the two movements on each other. Because of the sheer cumbersome weight of numbers the United States Movement lacks the student initiative and cohesiveness felt so sharply in the pages of the report. There is a greater closeness between the Canadian and British Movements, which has important implications for the Federation, as seen in the rôle of the Canadian delegation in the American-British-Canadian Reading Party held some years ago.

Where one generation of students passes along so quickly, and another is always coming on, it is easy to lose all sense of the whole in the parts. For this reason it is good to have such histories written down for other movements to read and ponder. The facts of student initiative, the religious centre from which the practical work has grown, and world-mindedness are important, but even more so is the feeling with which one closes the booklet, and reads the Prayer on the back cover, that here is a Student Christian Movement for which all the doors are open to carry forward its life and work into full maturity.

H. M.

THE CHRISTIAN BASIS OF A NEW SOCIETY. By Rose Terlin. Published by the World's Y.W.C.A. and obtainable at Headquarters of the National Associations.

Rose Terlin in her new study outline, entitled *The Christian Basis of a New Society,* has done a very sound and useful job. Back of this pamphlet lie many months of work in which Miss Terlin sought to gather material from Christians in many countries. The most important ecumenical documents are quoted at some length. There is a section on "Some Basic Elements of the Christian Faith" in which a very balanced statement of the theological background is presented. There follow chapters on political organisation with emphasis upon the problems of democracy, on economic reconstruction and on world order. In each chapter the analysis of the issues and a brief statement of most important points of view are accompanied by several pages of questions. I admire greatly the insight and skill with which all of this is done. The studies of equality and of democracy, for example, show remarkable discrimination.

There is no doubt that this pamphlet is not written for beginners. It would require a good deal of theological understanding to appreciate it fully. On the other hand there is no reason why leaders of groups should not find it most illuminating for themselves in planning their work even if they must do a lot of diluting with milk in working with their groups. Also, why should people be so abnor-

mally afraid to think and to pay the price for a little technical understanding in the field of religion when they know that other fields are not easily mastered? I think that Miss Terlin is so very ecumenical that she is rather unfair to the American Church! She seldom refers to any American religious literature. She leaves the impression that the American Church has had little to say about economic justice (see pp. 47-48). It is true that the American Church has no William Temple or his equivalent, but there is a great amount of teaching in the American Church by its leaders in line with Miss Terlin's interest. Any one-sidedness here can most easily be corrected by those who use these studies with groups. I hope that this study outline—and it is more than that—will have very wide use in the Student Movements and that the Churches will find here an excellent basis for co-operative thinking among their leaders.

JOHN C. BENNETT.

CONDITIONS OF PEACE. By E. H. Carr. *The Macmillan Company, New York, 1942.*

E. H. Carr's new book, *Conditions of Peace,* is an excellent one, well written, stimulating and constructive, and Professor Carr has all of us in his debt because of the valuable contributions that he has made and is making to the study of international affairs.

Mr. Carr, however, like all the rest of us, is still confused and uncertain as to the wise and workable solution of the problems which confront us and the world we live in, for while he emphasises the revolutionary character of our society,—and in this I agree with him,—his proposals regarding co-operation between Britain and Germany, and a new order in Europe do but echo the best of the tolerant liberalism of the 1920s. Personally I am sympathetic toward these proposals but I wonder if they will do the job that must be done. The situation is revolutionary because the great driving force behind the present unrest and conflict is the determination of masses of people, proletarian and "colonial", to gain power, and the transfer of power from class to class, or attempts to achieve it are almost always revolutionary. This basic struggle is complicated, too, by other very real differences and divisions,—race, colour, culture and nationalism,—which are potent factors in our modern world. Professor Carr writes that "the old world is dead." I wish I were as sanguine as he seems to be that revolution or change in themselves provide a solution of the conditions they react against. One of the great problems of human existence is due to the fact that we desire the two incompatibles, stability and change, and, as a society, demand

both at the same time. The satisfactory adjustment of these two social and biological incompatible essentials is perhaps the most difficult of our human problems. One of the important functions of lawyers, politicians and statesmen, is to try to devise a framework of procedures and formulæ, with which these two opposing forces can operate, as they must, without destroying both the individuals and the organisations which they serve. That is why I do not expect too much from change, revolution or a new order in themselves alone. They do destroy much of the old, and they do change the shape of things, but they leave practically all of the basic problems of human life and relations still to be solved, even if the solutions they offer are new and different ones. In addition it is certain that revolutionaries, having once achieved their new order, will then become the guardians of stability and the *status quo*. Professor Carr also suggests that "Peace" is not or should not be a positive end in itself,—that it is a happy by-product of other circumstances. He also seems to argue that war, apart from certain 19th century wars, are beneficial or at least that it is "the most purposeful of our social institutions" and that in the absence of a satisfactory substitute it performs an essential social function. I doubt both of these views. Peace I envisage as a condition in which violence of a destructive kind is absent or controlled, and one of the major tasks of statesmanship is to shape conditions in which our problems can be solved and our needs satisfied without resort to violence. For violence is always destructive and wasteful even if at times it may be the only alternative to suffocation. But even if this be true the ideal is not to condone violence but to attempt to provide for the necessary changes by non-violent means.

Certainly it seems to be a historical fact, that peace, in the sense of the control of violence, is one of the first stages or goals of developing communities and societies and is very definitely an end in itself. As for war, I do admit that under its emotional stimulus we do many things that would otherwise be impossible; we serve, we sacrifice ourselves and our possessions, we co-operate, we provide employment and we become more inventive and creative. But I do not believe that the tempo of war is a normal or natural one for human beings, and its main aim is the waste and destruction of resources both human and material. One of the dangers in the war situation is that we remember the interesting, exciting and apparently beneficial things that accompany it, but its aftermath, the post-war period and problems, we blame on anything and everything except their true cause, the war itself. War is a group condition somewhat akin to individual intoxication. While it lasts we enjoy a sense of exhilaration; the morning after, we may feel very uncomfortable, but we

usually blame it on something we ate, rarely on the liquor we drank. One of the few good things that I hope may come out of this war is a more general conviction that war doesn't pay anybody anything but sorrow and hardship. As long as any considerable group of people believe it does or may pay dividends, emotional or material, we shall have war, for human beings will only be taught the hard way and even then they must seemingly be taught at frequent intervals. I had hoped and believed that we peoples of the democracies, Britain, France, America, Canada, Holland and the rest, were persuaded that war did not pay. One of my fears is that we may emerge from this total war as military peoples with a vested interest in militarism, and with a military economy rather than a welfare economy as our social objective. If we do, God help us all!

This brings me to the last point I want to comment upon, and that is the emphasis which Professor Carr and many more of our contemporaries place upon the moral issues involved. He states it in these words: "The essential nature of the crisis through which we are now living is neither military, nor political, nor economic, but moral. A new faith in a new moral purpose is required to reanimate our political and economic system." For those of us who are members of Student Christian Movements, the sections of this book dealing with the moral issues involved are perhaps the most important and the most interesting, for they will determine the foundations upon which we build. Nearly everything that Mr. Carr writes about the inadequacy of the 19th century social philosophy is true, and one is deeply moved by his plea for a new and dynamic moral purpose. But I am always a little suspicious of those engaged in the consideration of social, economic and political questions when they emphasise at length morals and moral issues, for too often it is an escape from the tremendously difficult problem of finding ordinary workable solutions, which are, I believe, the only sound and permanent solutions. I fully appreciate the tremendous importance of group belief and group conviction about a cause or a person or an ideal, and I know that much of the strength of the new movements as well as our own weakness lies just here. Hitler's strength is not military or economic alone. Much of it lies in the united purpose of young Germany. But its base and strength is essentially emotional, and our emotions, particularly our group emotions, are dangerous things to play with. Only the young can live on their emotions or on a high emotional plane for any length of time, and even in their case I do not believe it is either natural or healthy. But this is the least of its drawbacks. The real danger or evil is the ease with which mass emotions can be manipulated or perverted and the speed with which they can get out of hand. If morals, or a moral

purpose, means a belief in the desirability of a better way of life for everybody, a determination to achieve this, and a willingness patiently to work out ways and means of achieving it; if it means the practical application of Christian principles to our individual and collective lives, then I am strongly in favour of it. But if it means mass movements of an emotional character I doubt its permanent value. It will have great power, it may achieve tremendous changes, but my own belief is that most worth while things are achieved by slow, patient, intelligent effort.

For, as I said earlier, our human needs and problems are continuing ones that can only be satisfied and solved in a piece-meal and day to day fashion. No plan, no system and no revolution can settle them completely and permanently. In the beginning of this review I suggested that I did not believe that the "liberal" solutions put forward by Professor Carr for the future of the Anglo-German relations were adequate. I say this although I like them myself and believe that they are the only desirable and satisfactory solutions in any long term sense. But they assume good will and a willingness to co-operate on the part of both parties or all parties concerned. The tragedy of the present situation is that these methods are not only discredited but are denied validity by large sections of humanity, who ridicule them and consider them evidence of softness and weakness. I would, regretfully, suggest that much firmer and tougher policies must be pursued if we are to meet the ruthlessness of the Nazis and the Japanese militarists with any expectation of holding them in check. That is why I put peace, or the control of violence and of unregulated force, so high in my category of essentials. Without such control we shall again become the victims of the gangster-like mentality—with it, and, in addition, with the qualities and procedures that Professor Carr advances, there are possibilities that the world of the future will be a somewhat better world than the one we have known.

Norman Mackenzie.

Notes on Contributors and Articles

JEAN BOSC is a former General Secretary of the French S.C.M. The article which appeared in *Correspondance Fédérative* has been translated by Dorothy Mackie.

ARNOLD NASH has been a secretary of the British S.C.M. and is now Chaplain to the S.C.M. in Toronto. His book entitled *The University and the Crisis in Liberal Democracy* will shortly be published.

CLARENCE P. SHEDD is a professor at Yale Divinity School, and the author of *Two Centuries of Student Christian Movements* and *The Church Follows its Students.* We are indebted to *The Intercollegian* for this article.

CHANG KUO-HSING is one of the members of the National Southwest Associated University who co-operated with the Kunming Student Relief Committee in giving first hand accounts of China's evacuated universities.

More Questions for Thinking Ahead was translated from the French by Margaret Patrick.

RICHARD ROBERTS is a Christian preacher and writer widely known in Great Britain, and North America. He has recently given greatly appreciated leadership to the New England S.C.M. on devotional and biblical lines.

J. C. ALEXANDER is a secretary of the Australian S.C.M. on leave for work with the Y.M.C.A. among the troops. His article is taken from *The Australian Intercollegian.*

The *Book Reviews* are by PRESIDENT N. A. M. MACKENZIE of the University of New Brunswick, PROFESSOR JOHN BENNETT of the Pacific School of Religion, and HELEN MORTON, Vice-Chairman of the W.S.C.F.

THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine of the World's Student Christian Federation

ROBERT C. MACKIE, *Editor*

Temporary addresses of the Editor, 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., U.S.A., and 151 Bloor Street W., Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada.

Volume XXXVI Second Quarter, 1943 Number 2

EDITORIAL

The Church: Neutrality or Decision?

As the time of separation of the constituent movements of the Federation from each other lengthens, new kinds of questions appear in the letters and articles which survive submarines and censors. Differences in our experiences, as some of us in danger and some of us in safety have faced the tests of war, have led to divergent understanding of the spiritual issues at stake. There is even a note of anxiety lest we be drifting so far apart that we may not be able to find each other's minds when we meet again at the end of military hostilities.

Outside Europe, political, social and economic plans for reconstruction are spreading like wildfire. There is the risk that such planning may disregard the problems of soul and spirit of those who have suffered the most, and without whose full co-operation and participation order can never be restored. The differences both in thought and feeling between those who have, and those who have not, been through the days of bombing, occupation and devastation must first be overcome before the groundwork of reconstruction is laid. To those for whom the price of admission to the fellowship of rebuilding cannot be suffering, then it must be the grace of humility.

This issue of THE STUDENT WORLD *is an attempt to look at some of the divergencies which beset us. The old questions arise: Can the Church be neutral to the conflict? Can it take sides without identifying political causes with the cause of the Kingdom? But these old questions arise in terms of new orientations. "It is a curious situation," writes the Chairman of the Federation, "that continental Christianity discovers that faith demands concrete decisions at the same time when the people of the Social Gospel (in the United States) suddenly become other-worldly, though the other world in which they live is not so much the transcendent world but rather the conception of the ecumenical church. I believe personally that the distinction now so often made as between citizen and Christian is an absolutely impossible one, and that I am not allowed to do as a citizen what I reject as a Christian. If then I take sides in this war, as I believe I must as a Christian, I cannot simply say that the Church or my organisation is completely out of the picture and remains completely neutral. My own feeling is, if we did what we ought to do, we should as an ecumenical movement and as a Federation speak out quite clearly in the situation and make unmistakably clear that on the one hand we cannot identify ourselves with any particular cause but that we must nevertheless judge very definitely as between the main causes which are now at stake."*

So we face a choice: to make concrete decisions or to remain neutral. By the new urgency of this choice we are driven back to consider completely afresh the bases of the Christian faith which underlie the political judgments which we make. We must dig down to the foundations of our thinking. Are we clear, for example, about the Judaeo-Christian understanding of God as Creator of ALL*? Do we see what this means in our relationship to the social and economic issues of the present moment?*

If God is the Creator of ALL *and Ruler of the Universe then must we not be active in the here and now, and does not every concern of this present gigantic struggle rightfully demand our actions? Does not seeing in God's purpose the inexorable drive through men's actions towards the restoration of God's order within the world, fill the Incarnation, the Atonement, our Lord's Resurrection—the sacramental life of the Church with fresh meaning?*

Or the reverse: must not those of us who exhibit the tendency to side-step active participation either by ourselves as Christians, or by our churches, ask ourselves whether we have not gone back to the belief that the forces of evil are out of God's control? Might it not be we shall end up by saying that He only wants us for His own world somewhere else, so we need take no part in the immediate affairs around us? By justifying neutrality we then end in an understanding of God's purpose as one of extricating man from this world entirely.

So the kind of doctrine we believe in determines the kind of living we do, and the degree to which we take part in the social and economic issues around us.

To separate the nature of Christian ethical teaching from its foundations in the Redemption wrought by Christ is to permit their inevitable change and deterioration. In reverse their closer and more conscious association is to increase their power over men's minds, and to give added meaning and drive to concrete decisions.

The foundations in the Redemption wrought by Christ are in the Bible; they are in the creeds and the sacraments; they are in the history of the Church of God. These are the sources from which we find the answers to questions about our responsibilities as Christians today. Can we listen together across the gulf that may separate us, finding in the listening the bridge to our unity? Have we the capacity to know ourselves to be bound together by the tests of action by which we are being judged of God? Can we see that by the very urgency of human suffering, He is calling us back to His work here *and* now*?*

In the words of the prophet Amos:

> *"The Lord of hosts is he that toucheth the land, and it shall melt. . . . It is he that buildeth his stories in the heaven and hath founded his troop in the earth; he that calleth forth the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth; the Lord is his name. . . . Behold the eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith the Lord. For lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations like as corn is sifted in a sieve. . . ."*

If we, fellow members of the Federation, are to meet the test of neutrality or decision, we must worship God as Creator of ALL. *He tests us in our willingness to take a stand during the days of conflict on each concrete issue. He sifts us as corn in a sieve during the days of hardships and suffering. And looking to the future, we know that those who are to be chosen to "build again the waste cities and inhabit them" are the ones among us who have most truly heard God's call.*

If we, fellow members of the World's Student Christian Federation, are to share in the building of waste cities and the inhabiting of them, then we must be true to God's calling now, *subject to His continual judgment, and willing to take a stand during the days of conflict on every concrete issue on which He tests us.*

H. M.

Christians in Europe

A Round Table Discussion Somewhere in Switzerland

The future of Christianity; an introductory speech

It is difficult to speak of Europe as a whole. Europe is not a geographical entity. However, it is made of countries whose history has been closely linked up for many centuries with the history of Christianity. What will be the fate of Christianity in the Europe of to-morrow? Is it to be life in the catacombs or a new Christian era?

On the one hand, there are those people who argue that we are clear as to the fate which awaits Europe under Nazi control. The Nazis themselves make no secret of the fact that the Church is to have no place in the new Europe, or at least that it must be put in a corner from which it will be unable to exert any real influence on the reshaping of European life. On either view the Church is looked upon as the last stronghold of a number of convictions which belong to the old order and must be wiped out to clear the ground for the building of the new order. This point is quite clear.

On the other hand, other people tell us that just because Christianity is exposed to such a frontal and fundamental attack, it may mean, and already does mean in certain countries, that the Church is again occupying a central place in national life. As Einstein has so clearly pointed out, resistance was centred in the Church. To use his own words,

"When the revolution came to Germany, I looked to the universities to defend freedom, knowing that they had always boasted of their devotion to the cause of truth; but no, the universities were immediately silenced. Then I looked to the great editors of the newspapers . . . and to the individual writers of Germany who had written much and often concerning the

N.B. In the last issue of THE STUDENT WORLD there appeared eight basic questions which had been posed by a Federation group meeting at Présinge near Geneva last September. Members of the constituent movements, trying to answer these questions, will find considerable illumination in these notes of a European discussion which raises these questions and, by implication if not otherwise, attempts an answer to them. In substance, if not in detail, they are based on fact.

place of freedom in modern life; but they too were mute. Only the churches stood squarely across the path of Hitler's campaign for suppressing truth. I never had any special interest in the Church before but now I feel a great affection and admiration because the Church alone has had the courage and persistence to stand for intellectual truth and moral freedom."

This resistance is not restricted to the Church in Germany. The same could be said for its witness in other countries in Axis-controlled Europe. Does not this mean that when the conflict is over, the Church will be in quite another position than before the war? Moreover, is it not significant that it is exactly those who are fully engaged in the great struggle who are the most optimistic as to the future of the Church?[1]

Thus we see that Christians draw quite opposite conclusions from the present situation. Some see the Church retiring into the catacombs and they would already advise the Church to withdraw from public life and to concentrate on those things that the powers of this world consent to leave to her as a kind of private hunting ground, whilst other Christians speak of after-war Europe as a new Middle Ages, for to them the present sufferings of our Christian civilisation in Europe is a kind of purification.

The Bible and the future

I find it a quite difficult task to live in an ecumenical world where some Christians prophesy a life in the catacombs and others see themselves on the threshold of a great Christian era. When I ask myself who is right, I am more and more inclined to think that both are wrong. When we ask ourselves what attitude the Bible requires from us regarding the future, we see that it is never an attitude dictated by some positive or negative utopia, but that we are asked to remain very close to the present moment. I am thinking of the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews where the great "today" of God recurs several times (Hebrews 3: 13; 4: 7); or again of the Epistle to the Corinthians: "behold *now* is the accepted time" (II Cor. 6: 2). Must we not learn to be much more simple and humble in our Christian life and is it not one of the great warnings God gives us through the present judgment that all our dreams are after all nothing

[1]See article: "The Future of the Church in Europe", 3rd Quarter of The Student World, 1942.

but human speculations? We speak like men who still believe that they have history in their pocket, while history entirely lies in the hand of God. May I illustrate what I mean by telling you of a book by an English author, C. S. Lewis, which made a great impression on me? It is called "The Screwtape Letters". The author starts with the assumption that there is in this world a hierarchy of devils; each has a certain field of activity, a certain number of men that he has to induce into temptation. In this hierarchy of devils each little devil is under the authority of a great devil who knows the way to deal with souls much better than the little devil and instructs him. The Great Devil is not Satan himself but something like his secretary of state, and the book consists of letters written by the Great Devil to a little devil who has run into difficulties in his Hell-appointed task of converting a young man away from Christianity. In his letters the Great Devil shows exactly where are the weak points of men and Christians. One thing this book has made me see so clearly is the difference between God's attitude and Satan's attitude towards time and eternity.

God wants men to be concerned both with eternity and with the present moment, for eternity is only revealed to us in the present moment, in the here and now. The devil's business is to get men to think neither of eternity nor the present moment. His great plan is to make men live in the future. The future is of all human things what is least akin to eternity and of all parts of time the most temporal. All vices are rooted in our thoughts about the future: greed, sensuality, ambition, communism, etc. In all our speculations about the future there is an escape from the present; the devil wants to convince us that it is no use caring for the present and his trick is to fill us with ideas about the future.

Thus, when we start making great plans for the Christian order of to-morrow, we must be careful lest it leads us to an escape from the reality of today. The Bible speaks of an obedience which is immediate, an obedience bound up with the present moment.

You may feel I have enlarged too much on this one point but I believe it is an essential one. God's judgment bears on our life, on the life of our Church, and must not become an object of speculation, because then we do not really stand under His judgment. A judgment always requires an act of obedience, of

immediate obedience. Our action must not be rooted in a preconceived idea of the future, this future we must leave to God. But we should ask ourselves: where does God's judgment touch me today? We must not speak in terms of the chances offered to the Church but in terms of the concrete obedience required from the Church here and now. We must not speak of a cross which is not our cross at the present moment, because we do not make our cross, we carry the cross God imposes on us at the present moment. If one asks: what is this act of obedience that God requires from me today? I think it is possible to answer, though not in quite general terms, If God's judgment is really accepted, it hits us in a very personal way. We should first of all ask ourselves: Does this immense judgment going on around us really touch me in my personal life? Nothing would be more sad than if Christians came out of these years of judgment unchanged. And this is true for the Church and for our S.C.M. When the prophets talk of judgment, they mean that a process of sifting, of separation is going on. The judgment is meant to give back its identity to the people of God, whose mission is quite special and which must be set apart, not because it has nothing to do with the world but because it has a unique mission in the world. The Church as the New Israel, like the Old Israel, is always in danger of losing itself in the world, of compromising with the world, of having covenants other than its covenant with God. Judgment is meant to clear the situation, to give back our identity.

The Church recovers her identity

The great tragedy of the last centuries is that the Church had lost her identity. But many Christians today do not yet understand what is meant when we speak of an identity of the Church, of a people set apart with a mission of its own. Through affliction, if she remains faithful to God, the Church recovers her identity. Already before the war the Church underwent a great process of liberation. This process has been intensified during the war; it is the process through which the Church again *becomes* the Church.

To say this does not mean that we speak more *about* the Church. A certain kind of ecclesiasticism may be a short cut: people try to renovate the Church in an external way. I am thinking for instance of certain liturgical movements where the

liturgy becomes an aim in itself. Or again, I think of certain forms of ecumenism which tends to unite the churches on their present level with the idea that the world will be faced with a powerful Christian front. We must dig far deeper. Ecumenism has only biblical meaning, real Christian meaning, if all the churches together are shaped increasingly into the Church of God. The Church must be ever more closely tied to her Lord and therefore free towards the world. Such a Church will really have something to say to Europe.

And now, let us come back to what we said in the beginning. A Church which is really the Church, will have a message for those who are desperate and who have faced the emptiness of their lives, a message for all those who have seen the demonic sides of life in Europe. Such a Church will be a daily reminder that there exists a Lord of the Nations, a Sovereign God, Judge and Saviour of men. Those men who will come back from the plains of Russia or from the concentration camps and who have seen there the utmost limits of life, will not have a long way to go. I believe they will find their way back to the Church without our having to go and fetch them. But this will not yet mean that we shall have a Christian society in the sense of a civilisation ordered according to the will of God.

However, in addition to those who will have made this profound discovery, there will be those whose life has been completely disrupted and whose life will be anarchy. That will not exhaust the groups for whom the Church will have a message. There will be those who have maintained a certain order of life and there will be countless numbers of young people who have lost all sense of direction who will count human life for nothing or very little because they have been degraded by the violence surrounding them.

Christianity and the European tradition

Thus we may have at the same time the beginning of a process of reintegration and a continuing process of disintegration worse than anything we have witnessed up to now. Let us not forget that what we may validly call the European tradition was a tradition which checked and kept within certain limits the devastating power of human passions and so restrained those forces from below man's rational consciousness which would, without that tradition, have wrecked European civilisation long

ago. Now that in a number of countries this tradition has been destroyed we may enter into a period of appalling and widespread anarchy. And this brings me to the other aspect of our question, namely our *obedience* as Christians in Europe.

What is the Christian Word we shall have to say in this situation? I am impressed by the fact of this anarchy, but also by the helplessness of Christians facing this anarchy. Or rather, I should say, by the state of anarchy prevailing amongst the Christians themselves concerning the foundations of Christian ethics. We all know that our Student Christian Movements in Europe have gone through a crisis about this question of Christian ethics and we have not come yet to the point of having a common basis from which to start in trying to solve it. That is why we must first of all liberate the Church and rediscover the message of the Gospel in order to lay a sure foundation. After that we shall have to build in relation to our concrete situation. One of the problems which will surely arise will be the drafting of a new constitution for the various European countries. What shall we have to say as Christians in this matter? Are we clear as to what must necessarily be put in such a constitution in order to avoid anarchy? Then there is the whole problem of the basis of law, of international law. There will be also our national tradition to rebuild. Have we definite things to say?

I do not fully agree with those who say that the Church can only act *augenblicklich und fragmentarisch* ("in the moment and fragmentarily"). There is a Revelation from God, there exists a Bible which says things about law and about the common life of men. But we have scarcely asked the Bible for an answer on these questions. We are so afraid of making a system of it. The Bible may not provide us with a system but it has definite things to say.

I have thought a good deal recently about the problem of "natural rights" because from several sides and especially from the Roman Catholic side we are told that this is the time to return to the great principles of natural rights. It is a matter of great concern to me that Protestant circles have scarcely started studying these questions; and the same is true of our S.C.M.

What do we really think about this famous question of the "Rights of Man"? Our modern conceptions are drawn from two sources, the Greeks on the one hand and the Church Fathers

on the other hand. The French and the American Revolutions have at least two roots, the Reformation and the Renaissance coupled with 18th century rationalism. Even today, I cannot but believe that natural law as taught from Roman Catholic pulpits is a syncretism of Christian and pagan elements whilst Protestant thinking is in a complete state of confusion. We must rediscover the biblical foundations of law, for the old concept of law, as taught in the Law Faculties of our Universities has no roots left and National-Socialism struck a deadly blow at them. We must rediscover the very foundations of law. Certainly these problems concern the lawyers but they deal with the basic foundations on which our whole society rests. There can be no common life without such foundations. The very existence of our universities also depends on such foundations. I believe that if the university has lost today any sense of direction it is because she has not stood for those fundamental rights when they began to be challenged.

The time has come when we must study our Bible more concretely than we ever did. We shall not find there a political framework that we could just apply to present-day society, but we shall find the great guiding lines showing us how God wants men to live their common lfe, and especially men who have been confronted with this revelation. It is possible and even certain that a civilisation like the Chinese civilisation may have certain conceptions of justice and human rights and of the dignity of men without having been confronted with the Christian revelation. It is my conviction that a post-Christian civilisation like ours cannot live as if it had never known the Christian message and must go back to its source if it is to live at all. If we really believe this, it means we have a great responsibility in proclaiming this message because the whole destiny of Europe is at stake, —not only her eternal salvation but also her immediate temporal fate.

Discussion

Dutch Student: I would like to see more clearly how you find those guiding lines in the Bible of which you spoke. I do not see them. Where shall we begin? What questions would you ask?

Chairman: We have in the Bible no systematic sociology, whether in the sense of a theory of society as it *is,* or in the sense of a social ethic determining what society *ought to be.* What

we possess is a proclamation of God's righteous judgment upon sin, and a Gospel of His forgiving love in Christ, from which springs a powerful impulse to deal with our fellow-men as generously as God has dealt with us, together with certain insights or "pointers", indicating the general direction in which we must move if we allow the Will of God to be our guide.

Dutch Student: When we endeavour to follow the direction of these "pointers"—especially if we try to do so *collectively*, in Christian *groups* and *movements*—don't we find ourselves led to formulate, on the basis of Christian Revelation, certain statements of *principle*, aiming to guide Christians in various times and places? These statements of principle are, it must be admitted, more applicable when we are protesting against existing social evils than when we are attempting to determine what, positively, should be done to correct them. They would be misused if any attempt were to be made to derive from them a specific line of action which would have all the authority of Christian Revelation behind it.

Chairman: I would like to avoid the word "principle" because we immediately fall into the Catholic conception of natural law, and we begin to build a system.

Federation Officer: The Bible certainly gives us clear guidance on certain points. One of the signs that Sodom is a wicked and accursed city is its attitude to the foreigner who dwells within its doors. We find a number of passages which mention the law of hospitality; God cares for the orphan, the widow, the foreigner. The Bible speaks so clearly that the Christian should have no hesitation whatever when faced with certain present-day regulations. He knows this legislation is against the law of God. We find instances which show that clearly all through the Bible. Of course there are also instances which seem in contradiction with the former and order a radical racial discrimination, but this is quite another problem which deals with the special mission of Israel.

Chairman: In this latter case we deal with Israel as a Church; the elected people must be set apart in order to fulfil its mission. We must develop an exegesis which will draw a clear distinction between what is said of the Church and what is said of the nation.

Federation Officer: Can anyone deny that the biblical teaching is clear on this matter of foreigners? At given moments certain

words in the Bible hit you directly in your present situation with exceptional power as a judgment from God. But the word "you must not injure or maltreat an alien among you" (Ex. 21: 22; 23: 9; see also Lev. 19: 33-34) remains true for all times. The theologians are sometimes in danger of complicating things which are clear and simple.

Chairman: It is easier in matters of private life. But things get more intricate when you try to find some form of life for Europe which might last a few months or a few years, or a century. Shall we stand for a federation of states? Have we something to say on the problem of national sovereignty? As a Christian I must take a stand and have a biblical basis for the stand I take.

A Swedish Member: I would like to come back to a point raised by the Chairman in his introduction. He spoke of the special function and responsibility of Christian students and more generally speaking, of the universities. A number of people do not believe any more in the unity of Europe and say that Europe does not exist any more. It is a very serious problem for the years to come. How shall we create a real community? In the Middle Ages the Church and the university were the two great links between the nations of Europe. The religious orders, the professors and students travelled from one country to the other and created the unity of Europe. Is it quite impossible that the same thing should happen after this war? God often takes us by surprise and He might use the Christian students in after-war Europe as He used them in the Middle Ages. We should not be too modest when we think of the task awaiting the Federation. We should never forget that Europe is a spiritual entity even more than it is a geographical one. We do not know what Europe will be like to-morrow geographically speaking. However our main concern as Christian students should be to do the will of God in preserving the spiritual reality of Europe. It is essential for us to safeguard the identity of Europe as a Christian reality; and this means we have to rediscover the identity of the Church because the Church is the essence of Europe. But while we look upon the Church as the centre, the nucleus of Europe, we must also think of the reconstruction around the Church, of an ordered community, and this order should draw its inspiration from the Church. This is the great task to which we Christian students should devote our

strength; we should re-think from a biblical point of view the meaning of law, of justice, of truth, of the state.

The nations in Europe will have gone through indescribable suffering, but this suffering takes different forms for various individuals and nations. This suffering will become part of the national heritage; it will be remembered and nations will glory in their past sufferings. They will feel that it is through these sufferings that they have won their victory. And instead of being an element of purification, bearing spiritual fruit, these sufferings may become an element of rivalry and competition; what is today a fundamental common reality may become a divisive factor, separating those who have gone through the most acute sufferings from those who have suffered less,—the neutrals and perhaps also the Anglo-Saxons. What can we do about it as Christian students? I believe the W.S.C.F. will have a great task of interpretation in order to help the leading group in the various nations, to understand the sufferings of other nations which should not be too quickly forgotten.

The other task which I would mention is the problem of the relation of the *truth of God*, as revealed in His Word, with *the truth* as something which humans discover—the aim of the modern secularised university. We live in a Europe where the very concept of truth has been emptied of its meaning in countries under a totalitarian regime. During the war this process has been intensified. Even Christians like ourselves are not quite sure of what "truth" means. Our friends in the occupied countries have often to say things which objectively speaking should be called lies.

Should you always speak the truth to the occupying power, even when it means a death sentence for other people? A well-known theologian has written an interesting letter showing that our concept of truth is still of a moralistic kind. He says that the truth is what is according to the will of God as revealed in Christ. It may be the will of God that you tell a lie to save a life or to promote a cause; then it is no sin, it is no lie. You can do it with a good conscience. This is very important.

X: I remember a case when a man was asked who wrote a certain statement. He said he did not know. But when he was asked if he agreed with the statement, he said yes. In the first place it was a case of saving his friends. In the second case, he was bearing witness to what he believed to be the truth

whatever the risk. If you take the will of God seriously you can never lie when it means a denial of your Christian belief.

Swedish Member: I agree and I would add that we are witnessing a total war which forces men back to elementary biological realities and the consequence of this is that we depreciate such values as science, thought, truth. I believe that in the after-war period a tremendous responsibility will rest on the universities and especially on Christian professors and students; they will have to re-think all these problems.

Federation Officer: I wonder if the university will really have the leading rôle which you foresee in the world of to-morrow? Is not the leadership passing much more into the hands of the working class? It is terribly serious that there exist so few contacts between the Church and the whole world of labour. Students have a chance in the working camps to live in close contact with young workmen. Should that not help to build up a new relationship?

Swiss Student: I believe this is true. But how could the S.C.M. establish contacts with the workmen? There are "false contacts" of a patronising kind which are worse than nothing.

Second Swiss Student: The Church should take the social problem much more seriously. She should proclaim that certain conditions of life imposed on the workers are completely unacceptable from the Christian point of view. Our churches have a terribly "bourgeois" mentality.

Chairman: I am not sure that the problem is mainly one of machinism, as is often said. What we really lack is an organic community where each human being would have a place of his own, a sense of human dignity. Labour cannot always be of an interesting kind, but there should be a counterpart during the hours you do not spend in your regular work, where you really feel a part of the community as a whole. Europe will be so poverty-stricken after the war that we cannot expect the workmen to reach the level of life of the middle class but rather the reverse!

Swiss Student: The great problem in the army and everywhere is that men should be treated as *men.*

British delegate: In Britain the war has given a new sense of dignity to the manual worker because he knows that he con-

tributes in this way to the national cause. This sense of dignity should be transposed to a higher level.

Swiss Student: In an anti-Christian country like Russia, the workman has a sense of personal dignity that he has not in our so-called Christian societies; but his work is not pleasanter than anywhere else and wages are lower.

The "Workers' Fellowship" has done a good piece of work in Switzerland; workers have a say in the management of the factory and this gives them a sense of responsibility.

British delegate: I should like to come back for a while to what you said about the liturgical movements tending to be an aim in themselves. I do not believe this is quite fair to them. What they are seeking for is a new and more direct apprehension of the reality of God. Stress is laid on worship, on adoration as the way through which our inner life will be transformed. War does not only have the effect of letting loose our biological instincts, it also forces men to face the fundamental realities of life. Rather than seeking for great principles should we not try to meet men where they are, in their concrete situation? We should try to understand what is at the bottom of all this vitalism and revolutionary dynamism and go further in order to formulate what we mean by "justice" in an existential way.

Chairman: Our difficulty in the Federation is that our members in the Anglo-Saxon world still live in, and so can think in terms of, a civilisation which rests on certain common presuppositions. Here in Europe we have no such common basis left. Sweden and Switzerland would be an exception, their situation is similar to that of Britain and the States. But our continental civilisation as a whole has lost its foundations. And the only hope of recovering them is a great Christian revival which will acknowledge that there is an Almighty God and that Christ is Lord over our civilisations.

American Christians and the War

John C. Bennett

The American Churches have approached this war and the issues that lie behind it with a divided mind. They have a bad conscience because of their "all out" support of the last war. For years the characteristic Christian teaching in America was influenced by disillusionment concerning the results of the last war and by various forms of pacifism. Distance from the armies and the secret police of the Axis powers created a situation in which it was easy for these two factors—disillusionment about the last war and pacifism—to control the minds of Christians.

Influence of Pacifism

The attack upon Pearl Harbor and the actual belligerency of this country made a difference, but not as great a difference among the leaders of the Churches as might have been expected. The pacifists ceased to be obstructionists in most cases but they retained their essential outlook. They steeled themselves against the temptation to change their minds because of public pressure. As time went on and the pacifists found themselves pastors of men who were in the armed services and their families, many of them came to take a very different attitude. They allowed some of their doctrinaire positions to fall into the background and they overcame any tendencies that they may have had toward self-righteousness and identified themselves with those who are in the war without in most cases changing their judgments concerning the issues of the war. There have been surprisingly few cases of pacifist ministers who have lost their churches because of their stand in this war. The most influential Protestant journal, *The Christian Century,* after a long record of opposition to the interventionist tendencies in the Church and to the foreign policy of the government, a record that was characterised by a combination of isolationism and Christian scruples about war which gave the impression of pacifism, suddenly changed and became a supporter of the war effort. It developed a whole theology about war which combined some

important religious insights with unconscious journalistic ingenuity that enabled it to retain its blind spots, to support the war without taking back anything that it had said before Pearl Harbor. Judging from the letters that it has published it made few converts among its pacifist admirers.

The Roman Catholic Church and the War

It should be said that the Roman Catholic Church switched overnight and clothed itself with the garb of conventional patriotism. It became quite unreserved in its support of the war both in its public prayers and in its pronouncements. This attitude is all the more remarkable because of the very strong anti-Russian and anti-British sentiments in that Church. Probably its shift is the result of its traditional teaching about the support of the state, its freedom from the influence of Christian pacifism, and its desire to compensate for its minority status by avoiding offence to the majority. I confess that while I agree with its leaders about the importance of military victory I think that it has taken this position in such a way as to sacrifice important Christian insights of which it as the Church with greatest claim to universality might have remained the guardian.

It is very natural for the observer of the American Churches to exaggerate the influence of pacifism among them. There are very few pacifists among the laymen. A majority of the clergy are convinced supporters of the government and have never been pacifists. In some denominations, such as the Episcopal Church, pacifism has never been very strong. I think that it would be a safe generalisation to say that among the ministers under fifty who are "progressive" in their theological and social views pacifism is the majority opinion. Also, it is probably true that if one were to select the twenty-five preachers of greatest national influence, a majority would be pacifists. Recently I had occasion to write to a group of preachers and professors of Homiletics. I chose somewhat at random thirteen men for my purpose which had nothing to do with the question of pacifism but with their competence as preachers. I discovered after making the selection that of those thirteen eight were on record as pacifists. It has often been said that there is a marked difference between preachers and theologians in regard to pacifism. A great many of our most influential theologians were strong interventionists before America entered the war. A writer who consulted many

theologians and preachers with the idea of interpreting this fact came to this conclusion before America's entrance into the war: "By and large, however, the weight of personal testimony would seem to indicate that there is probably an even division among both theologians and ministers, with the non-interventionists having a slight edge." But he adds: "Probably the most vocal theologians are interventionists and the most vocal ministers are non-interventionists."[1] That last statement agrees with my impression, but I should want the word "vocal" used in a neutral rather than in a derogatory sense and to associate it on both sides with extent of influence.

The Ecumenical Mind

There is one very interesting fact about the distribution of opinions about the war that should be emphasised. Those who have had most experience of the ecumenical Church, who have most responsibility within the ecumenical movements, are not pacifists and were interventionists before Pearl Harbor. I can think of very few exceptions to this generalisation. My interpretation may be biased because I agree with those who are in this group but it is difficult for me to resist the conclusion that it is their sense of solidarity with the sufferings of people in the conquered countries of the world and their vivid realisation of what an Axis victory would mean to everything for which the world Church stands, that have led them to this point of view. One has found the same tendency among those who have been missionaries in China. For them, as for those who are in close contact with Europe, the kind of aggression that leads to the extension of totalitarian tyranny is not an abstraction but a concrete horror which seems even greater than the concrete horror of war.

Divided Mind of Protestant Churches

The pronouncements of the Protestant Churches have in most cases shown the divided mind to which I referred at the beginning of this article. Though the pacifists are numerically in a minority they have had great influence on the resolutions of Church bodies. They have had this influence in part because they are in strategic positions in the denominations. Also, the non-pacifists in many denominations have sought to avoid any

[1]Samuel S. George: "Opinions on the War" *Presbyterian Tribune* (Nov. 1941)

action that completely overrides the convictions of the minority. The point of view of the Oxford Conference report that recognises that there are at least three points of view about war which have a place in the Christian Church is generally accepted. On the other hand, the lack of clear statements by the Churches in relation to the issues of the war has misled the country into thinking that pacifism is stronger in the Church as a whole (ministers and laymen) than it actually is and it has prevented the Church from giving adequate guidance at the point of most urgent need. It was largely to correct this situation that the Federal Council of Churches at its biennial session in December 1942, made a statement which was clearer in its assertion of what is at stake in this war than any previous statement by as representative a body. Because of this statement, the Federal Council was strongly attacked by *The Christian Century* on the ground that it had put the Church into the war. The statement actually is written with great discrimination. The fact that the Federal Council has taken this lead confirms what I have said about the attitudes of those who are identified with the ecumenical Church because the leadership of the Council is closely associated with the ecumenical movements.

"Christianity and Crisis"

To counteract the well organised pacifist influence in the Churches, those who have long believed that Christians as Christians should support the struggle against the Axis and who before Pearl Harbor were strongly "interventionist" in their political views, established the journal, *Christianity and Crisis,* a bi-weekly publication that is edited by a committee of which Reinhold Niebuhr is the chairman. The platform of this journal is as far removed from conventional nationalism or militarism as it is from pacifism. It sees the war as a world-wide struggle for freedom. It is as much concerned as are the pacifists to prepare now for the peace though it stresses the preparation that will come through strengthening the ties between the United Nations as the nucleus of a new world order rather than paper plans for a distant future. It keeps the government under criticism and seeks at all times to preserve a Christian perspective on the war. It is significant that its editor, Reinhold Niebuhr, is also chairman of an organisation that is called "The Friends of German Freedom". *Christianity and Crisis* always opposes

the one-sided anti-German attitude of a Vansittart. British readers may be able to place the point of view of *Christianity and Crisis* if I say that it is very close to that of Archbishop Temple. On the whole it resembles that of *The Christian News-Letter* though it does differ from the latter in tone largely because *The Christian News-Letter* was established within a nation that was already a belligerent, and hence sought to counteract some of the aspects of belligerency from a Christian point of view, whereas *Christianity and Crisis* had the job from the beginning of counteracting the opposite tendency to evade the issues of the war in the interests of neutrality.

The differences within the American Churches and the confusion in many individual minds should not hide the fact that there are important common attitudes which both pacifists and non-pacifists share. In fact I believe that inconvenient and wrong-headed as much pacifism is, the twenty years of pacifist influence have left very good deposits in the thought of American Christians. Twenty years from now it may be easier to recognise this than it is today. My impression is that the restraint that is characteristic of Christians today is in part the result of years of pacifist teaching.

Certain Attitudes Shared by Christians

We can see the common attitudes which most Christians share in four areas: (1) The refusal on all sides to turn this war into a "Holy War"; (2) the general support of the opportunities that are given to conscientious objectors; (3) the willingness to keep the policy of the government under Christian criticism; (4) the emphasis upon the importance of preparing now for the peace. I shall discuss briefly each of these points.

This is not a Holy War

(1) The unwillingness to identify the Church as a Church with the war without reservation and the realisation that in some respects the war is a judgment upon our nation and its allies represent a gain upon the attitude of the Churches of America in the last war. There is a difference of emphasis here, of course, between pacifists and non-pacifists. Many pacifists dwell upon the past sins of the United Nations and seem to be almost unaware of the monstrous evils that are now perpetrated by the Axis powers. But few Christian leaders see this war as a struggle

between righteous and unrighteous nations. The non-pacifists believe that there is a righteous cause at stake and that this cause depends upon a military victory for the United Nations but they realise that this cause would be betrayed by nations that fight with self-righteous fury. There is a religious dimension in the life and thought of most American Christians which enables them to think of all nations as under the judgment of God. For the most part, Christian leadership sees the moral conflict that war brings to any sensitive conscience and there is no tendency to idealise war.

Attitude to Conscientious Objectors

(2) Before the beginning of this war most American Churches had developed a policy which provides for the defence of the conscientious objectors. They have been in large part responsible for the very liberal policy of the government in regard to conscientious objectors in this war. The national Church bodies have passed innumerable resolutions recognising the rights of the Christian conscience, and both pacifists and non-pacifists among the clergy have adhered to this position. It is true that the so-called "Peace Churches" (the Friends, the Mennonites and the Church of the Brethren) have borne more than their share of the expense of supporting the conscientious objectors in the Public Service Camps. That cost has to be carried by private agencies. The larger denominations have been unwilling to use undesignated funds for this purpose because of the possible repercussions from laymen who do not yet share the official attitudes of the Churches on this matter.

Christian Criticism of the Government

(3) The Churches in this country have not allowed themselves to become an echo of the government. One illustration of the agreement of pacifists and non-pacifists is their attitude toward the evacuation of the Japanese Americans (most of whom are American citizens) from their west coast homes. I have been unable to discern any important difference between pacifists and non-pacifists on this issue. Individuals disagree as to whether or not the original evacuation was a necessity but there is no serious disagreement among Christian leaders about the policy of detention. To keep American citizens in internment camps is abhorrent to all, and not least to the Christian leaders

on the coast who know the Japanese best. I asked the executive of one large denomination if there were any ministers in his denomination on the coast who took an unsympathetic attitude toward these Japanese Americans and he answered that not more than one per cent. took such an attitude. That is remarkable when you consider the large amount of public prejudice that exists. One of the most violent attacks on the government, not only for the detention of the Japanese Americans but even for the evacuation policy, was an editorial in *Christianity and Crisis*. On this matter there is no difference between *Christianity and Crisis* and *The Christian Century*.

Problems of the Post-War World

(4) The American Churches are united in their realisation that at best military victory can do no more than stop something. They also realise that war in itself is a bad training for the tasks of construction that will come with the peace. The pacifists and the non-pacifists are united in their conviction that they should prepare now to lay the foundations for the post-war world. They are at one in rejecting policies of vengeance, American isolationism and American imperialism. The Federal Council of Churches appointed a commission two years ago, headed by Mr. John Foster Dulles, to guide the Churches in this task of preparing for peace. This commission sponsored the Conference at Delaware, Ohio, in March, 1942, the report of which is the most important utterance of American Christians about the problems of the post-war world. This report had behind it the work of both pacifists and non-pacifists and seems to be acceptable to both.

The Federal Council commission is handicapped in some respects by the disagreement between these two groups. It must completely ignore the fact that the just and durable peace that it seeks is impossible without a military victory for the United Nations. Also, it is inclined to ignore the urgent problems that will face the victorious nations at the conclusion of hostilities. Such matters as the treatment of Germany and Japan and the policing of parts of Europe are too controversial to be frankly faced. Another difficulty has been that as a commission it has only recently been able to emphasise the importance of solidarity with the other nations among the United Nations though many of its members, including Mr. Dulles, have seen this very clearly.

There is a fear on the part of many non-pacifists that when the war is over the pacifists will still be too perfectionist to support the measures that are necessary to provide for order and security. On this point American pacifists would be divided and I am quite sure that the majority would not oppose such measures in principle if they had the sanction of most of the world community. But many will still be negative about these things, either because of perfectionist principles or because of their distrust of our European Allies, a distrust that has been built up through the years as a defence of their pacifism. In order to set forth a clear position about the peace which is not confused by pacifism, isolationism or imperialism, a movement has been formed which is called: "Christian Conference on War and Peace". It is entirely unofficial and it has the backing of the people who support *Christianity and Crisis.* This movement was not founded to oppose the Federal Council Commission but to supplement the latter which is handicapped by its official status and the differences of opinion among its members.

Reconciliation between Christians

Readers of this article who know at first hand what Axis aggression means to persons around the world may be shocked at the evidence that it presents of a strange detachment on the part of many Christians in America. The minds of many of the most sensitive and most deeply committed Christians were formed before it became as apparent as it is today that the violence that accompanies resistance to totalitarian tyranny is less evil than the tyranny itself. It is difficult for such minds to change until they know as much as our friends in Europe and Asia know about this tyranny. It is often assumed that they are chiefly controlled by a too simple theological liberalism and that it is this that accounts for their pacifism. Personally, I believe that this influence is exaggerated. There are many liberals who are not pacifists. Liberalism did not develop many pacifists in the last war. Moreover, one of the most convincing statements of the idea that in the modern world war is the greatest of all possible evils is in Brunner's *The Divine Imperative,* an idea that Brunner himself has abandoned not for theological reasons but because of what events have taught him. When this war is over there will be a problem of reconciliation not only between enemies but between those who have suffered

most and those who have seemed to live in a detached and unreal world when the great issues of the struggle were being decided. I hope that Americans who are not pacifists but who understand the influences that have produced so many pacifists (perhaps they have in the past contributed to those influences!), and who retain a good deal of sympathy with the young American Christian who has been subjected to these influences in the Church and the Student Christian Movement, may help in this reconciliation. On all sides there will be needed a realisation of the contradictions in any Christian decision in regard to war and there will be needed the grace of humility.

The People of God

W. A. Visser 't Hooft

To know the people of God is to know its history. For God is a God Who acts, Who reveals Himself in action. And His people is unique, not by its own qualities, nor by its successes and achievements, but by the fact that it is the subject of a divine history, of an "other history".

So it is not enough to study the unfolding of the history of the people of God on the horizontal plane. What do we really learn of this people when we have classified its chronicles in chronological order, and traced the evolution of its religious and moral thoughts? The significance of its life is the vertical history which comes from above and strikes across the horizontal history. If we wish to know the people of God we must try to understand the plan of the interventions of God among His own. The peculiar laws, special chronology and mysterious order of this plan are not recognisable outside the realm of faith. That is why the Bible, the book of God's history, is so disconcerting for all who wish to reduce history to a conversation between men, and refuse to admit that God has His word to say in human affairs. George Bernard Shaw in one of his plays shows us a cowboy who at the end of a life full of incident reaches an understanding of human affairs as they really stand. He expresses it in the following words: "There are two games in this world —the little game we play together and the big game played on us." That is exactly what it is. To understand the big game, God's game, we must avoid all speculation as to the rules by which it is played; we must merely listen to the history which God tells us Himself.

A People Set Apart

God has chosen Himself a people from among all the peoples of the earth. He sets it apart, and demands that it should consecrate itself wholly to His service. He promises that He in His turn will take a very special care of it. "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye

shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people." (Exodus 19: 5.) And God keeps His promise. For this tribe of nomads becomes a people by His initiative, by His tireless aid. He saves it from extinction in freeing it from the hands of the Egyptians. He makes a people which is coherent and conscious of its mission by the law He gives it on Sinai. He finds a country for it to dwell in. He leads it in a straight course throughout its life. He aids it in battle. Truly this people owes everything to God.

The Bible often says that with God there is no respect of *persons*. But can there have been any respect of *peoples* with Him? Did He choose Israel because Israel was more worthy to be loved than other peoples? No, God tells it that it is not because of its importance in itself that He chose Israel, "for ye were the fewest of all people". (Deuteronomy 7: 7.) Nor because of its obedience: "The Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness; for thou art a stiff-necked people." (Deut. 9: 6.) But how then are we to understand this choice? The only answer given us is that God wishes to have "a special people unto Himself" (Deut. 7: 6), a holy nation, that is, a nation entirely consecrated to His service (Exodus 19: 6; Deut. 7: 6).

Then is God not interested in the other nations? Yes, He means to save the other peoples through Israel. He means to prepare for the coming of His Kingdom over all the earth by manifesting His rule over one given people. Even in the time of Abraham, when the people of Israel had only a potential existence, God had promised them that all the families of the earth should be blessed through the people whose father Abraham was destined to be. On Sinai He calls His people "a people of sacrificers", and thus confirms that this people is to represent the kernel of a kingdom which shall contain the whole of humanity. That is why Israel is called the "first-born" (Exodus 4: 22). Its whole existence is turned towards the future. The prophets announce that all the peoples shall come in the end to the Mountain of the Eternal. Israel shall be a "blessing in the midst of the land" (Isaiah 19: 24). If Israel is set apart, if it is forbidden to "learn the ways of the heathen" (Jeremiah 10: 12), that does not mean that Israel has nothing to do with the other nations; it does mean that God is forging Himself an instrument fit to be used for the salvation of the entire world.

But in this way the existence of Israel represents a great challenge flung before the other peoples. This insignificant nation pretends that it knows a God Who is the only true God and Who demands a reckoning from all the peoples. The message which Israel brings and which it incarnates means the absolute condemnation of all idolatry, of all glorification of race, or blood, of all adoration of chiefs or sovereigns, of all national messianism. The judgments which Isaiah is to pronounce against the Babylonian king, Ezekiel against the king of Tyre, Daniel against Nebuchadnezzar, are so many reminders that God does not tolerate a man's putting himself in His place. That is why the blessing Israel brings is so often understood as an insult to national values. That is why anti-semitism is in the last analysis, and has been for thousands of years, a protest against the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob.

But it is not only the heathen who rage against the God of Israel. The Israelites do it themselves. The people that owes everything to God will not live *for* God. God is compelled to declare: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt" (Hosea 11: 1). Stephen is later to say of the Jews that they are always in opposition to the Spirit (Acts 7: 51). The people finds the burden of election too heavy for their shoulders, and is perpetually in a state of revolt against its true Saviour. But God continues to struggle with His people, and will not let it go. Each rebellion is followed by an intervention of God to call His people to order. Sometimes He uses the means of persuasion and puts His word in the mouth of a prophet who pleads His cause. Sometimes He speaks by a solemn warning, by a great disaster which strikes the entire disobedient nation. The defeats of the people and that particular defeat which means the Exile, are but so many judgments to bring Israel to repentance.

What does this recalcitrant people really want? It wants the same as all men and all peoples want, two incompatible things: to be in a privileged position as to its rights, and to fare like the rest of the world with regard to responsibilities.

In this way it explains its election as a privilege which it has earned and which shall be inalienable. God must bless Israel, that is His task. The people cries out, "My God, we know Thee." (Hosea 8: 2), but continues in its usual path. Jeremiah describes this attitude in ironic words: "Wilt thou not from this

time cry unto me, 'My father, thou art the guide of my youth'? (notice the tone of false intimacy with God!) Will he reserve his anger forever?" (Jer. 3: 4). The false prophets, whom the people hears gladly, will separate it from its true God by their preaching of a false security: ". . . They have seduced my people, saying, Peace; and there was no peace; and one built up a wall. . . ." (Ezek. 13: 10). God by His prophets is about to destroy the wall and force the people to look Him in the face.

Does the people think itself eternal? A voice echoes: "Surely the people is grass. The grass withereth . . . but the word of our God shall stand for ever." (Isaiah 40: 7-8). The people will not be able to find eternity within itself, nor to share in eternity, except by submitting itself, by losing its life in the Lord's Name, by shunning the great temptation to settle down in the present, by turning its face resolutely towards the future and thus shutting itself off from the facile and terrestrial life of other peoples.

But the people will not have an exceptional kind of rule. It wishes to be like other nations. An example of this is seen in the story of the institution of kingship. It is too difficult to have an invisible King and to live by faith. The servitude of other nations seems greatly preferable, far more comfortable and less dangerous than the glorious liberty of the children of God. So the people says to Samuel: ". . . we will have a king over us. That we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles." (I Samuel 8: 20). Thus it refuses its privileges and chooses to have its king only to suffer the consequences of its choice.

But God is a God of immense patience. He does not cease to struggle with His people. He uses all imaginable means; He reminds it again and again of what He has done for Israel. He threatens, warns, pleads, promises. But the people always relapses into rebellion, or, what is worse, into indifference.

Will God give up His plan? No, He will accomplish it, but in a different way. If His people will not be in alliance with Him, it shall be judged. If it will not accept His love, it shall have His anger. Will God then destroy His people? No, rather His anger is the proof of the seriousness of His love. His judgment is His way of working for the salvation of His rebellious people. Isaiah explains it in a parable: The peasant tills the soil, but it is to prepare the land for sowing. "This also

cometh forth from the Lord of hosts, which is wonderful in counsel, and excellent in working." (Isa. 28.) And Jeremiah hears the Eternal saying at the very beginning of the Exile: "The people which were left of the sword found grace in the wilderness: even Israel, when I went to cause him to rest. . . . I have loved thee with an everlasting love." (Jer. 31). If God makes His people suffer, it is that they may learn to obey.

But as there are some who never learn anything, and who become hardened through suffering instead of repenting, God proceeds by the method of *concentration.* His promises shall remain valid, but only for such as truly are His people. Hereafter there will be a distinction between Israel and the true people of God, the *remnant* within Israel. Hereafter it must be said as St. Paul said it: "For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel." (Romans 9: 6). The true people of God will consist of the "children of the promise" (Romans 9: 8), that is, those who hear the promise through judgment. In the time of Sinai the entire people constituted the Church. Afterwards these two realities became separated from each other. The separation has not yet become definite, but it is already clear that membership of the people of God is not a matter of flesh and blood.

In this way there is a progressive shrinking in God's plan. The circle of salvation becomes narrower; God has begun His work with humanity at large. He began the work with one single people from among the peoples of the earth. Now He operates through a remnant, a faithful minority of that people. Then does God forget the mass of mankind, the multitudes of His creatures whose need of Him is so great? No, He concentrates on a smaller number in order to reach the greater. He gathers His strength for another leap. So mindful is He of the others that side by side with the message of the remnant must be set the message of universal salvation. Isaiah, the prophet who calls his son Shear-jashub ("a remnant shall return") is also the prophet who proclaims that all the nations shall "flow unto the mountain of the Lord" (Is. 2).

But this process of concentration is not at an end. There comes the supreme moment when the people of God consists of a single Figure. When Jesus Christ climbs towards Golgotha He *alone* is the people of God. He bears the whole weight of God's work for this world. At that moment there was not even a remnant, but only a Man who obeyed even unto death on the

Cross. But at that moment it became clearer than ever that God is still interested in His creatures. The One is dead, "And not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad." (St. John 11 : 52), or, as St. Paul expresses it : "One died for all." (II Cor. 5 : 14). In this way is the path made plain for a *new people of God.*

The New People

It is indeed a *new* people. For in Jesus Christ the re-creation of the world has begun. The kingdom of God has made its appearance in this old world. He who is in Christ is a new creature. The Church is the organ of this new creation. It represents in this world the world which is to come. It is the people of whom Daniel had already spoken—the people of the last days, of the eschatological days; the saints of the Highest, the people from whom Joel prophesied that he would receive the Holy Spirit.

But if this chosen people lives by the Spirit of God, does that not mean that it is no longer a people in the flesh? Here once more the prophesies are fulfilled. The time has come when the other peoples, which lived beside the people of God and which seemed to be forgotten by God, are called to salvation. It took all Saint Paul's radicalism to make the apostles understand that this great revolution was inevitable. It was a decisive moment in the history of God when James dared to announce before the assembled apostles that God "at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name" (Acts 15 : 14). That was tantamount to the unbelievable assertion that the wall of separation which had stood between Israel and the other peoples for thousands of years had now fallen. Thereafter God would form His own people from among all the peoples of the earth.

Does this mean that the continuity of God's work is broken? No, this new people is no arbitrary invention, it is formed to continue the work begun with and by Israel. In this way it becomes the lawful heir of Israel. It has a right to the great titles of Israel. The very title of "the Church" comes straight from the Old Testament where it means the assembly of the people convened by God. For since the Cross, it is the Church and not the Jews which represents the true Israel, the spiritual Israel. The wicked husbandmen have killed the king's son. That

is why the kingdom of God is taken from them and given to those who will produce the fruits of it (St. Matthew 21: 43). The new people is heir to the promises made by God to Israel, in so far as it accomplishes God's plan for Israel, in so far as it is the adequate instrument—more adequate than Israel was—for the work of re-creation which God cannot lay down.

Thus the new people receives great promises, and with the promises a crushing responsibility. Its task is now to become what it *is,* to live on the level of the promise. God says: "I will be their God, and they shall be my people", but He also says: "Come out from among them, and be ye separate." (II Cor. 6: 17). This people must excel, it has no right to be like the others. It must be, not *one,* but *the* Light of the world. It is a colony of the other world in this world. Therefore it must live really like a *people,* in complete solidarity, and yet also like a *new* people, united not by earthly bonds, but united in Christ, whose Body it is. Thereby it is emphasised that the Church is truly a race apart, a different people, and a new phenomenon in the history of the nations.

These first Christians did not only dream of this new people. They *were* that people. They were so much that people that even their adversaries called them the "tertium genus", the third race beside the Romans and the Jews. What a deep meaning there is in that nickname! The Church is truly a people, but a people which cannot be classified in any known category.

The new people stood not only side by side with the other peoples, but also face to face with them. In proclaiming that there is but *one* holy people, it denies the pretensions of others to be *eternal.* In proclaiming Jesus as the *kurios,* the one Lord, it denies the gods of the peoples. What defiance of the pagan world with its cults of the Emperor and of the national gods—what an insult to the peoples who worship themselves! We can understand the indignation of a Caecilius who cried out: "It is a people which shuns the light of day, which scorns the temples and the gods, which mocks sacred things. . . . Monsters!"

The Grandeur and the Wretchedness of the New People

What is to be done with a people which will fit into no framework? As all efforts to exterminate it merely strengthen it, statesmen come to the conclusion that they had better make some agreement with it. That is why Constantine and his

successors offer the Church a pact of friendship and collaboration, which they think will be to the advantage of both parties. Attend, oh people of God! Is this really to your advantage? Will you not become like other peoples? Remember that your history began with a great exodus, and that God made you leave the country where you wished to settle.

But the attraction of a peaceful life is too strong. In theory it triumphs over the others, but in fact there is interpenetration between them. Rome is christianised while the Church is romanised. The Spirit of Rome, that spirit of the legal code and institutionalism, that spirit so wholly terrestrial and turned towards the present, competes with the Holy Spirit; that spirit of freedom and prophecy, that eternal spirit which looks towards the future of God. So the people of God ceases to be a new people. The old misunderstandings which had already threatened the people of Israel appear once more. The people of God establishes itself just like other peoples. It will own a chief who "will march at their head", who will try to dominate them, yes, who will even claim the "*dominium mundi*" (world-domination). Boniface VIII dares to pretend that "every human being is subject to the Pope of Rome".

Now the Church believes its privileged position is eternal and inalienable. In this way history repeats itself. The great warnings given by God to the Old Israel are forgotten and it is the New Israel which becomes sure of itself. It forgets the fundamental distinction: "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them. . . . But ye shall not be so; but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve." (St. Luke 22: 25-26). It boasts of its success. It has forgotten that these earthly triumphs may be written down as defeats in the chronicles of God.

Oh, the Church still does great things. It still has the sense of being a *people,* of forming a community which transcends all divisions among men. So it can still subdue pagan peoples. But it does so more and more according to the rules of this world, and ceases to be a *new* people in the sense of a *new* creation.

Thus once more the point of crisis is reached; a divine judgment is leading to a new exodus. The Reformers hear the cry: "Depart from Babylon", and themselves depart in order that the people may be re-established in holiness. For a time it seems as if the great rebirth of the people of God is come. In

the 16th century there is in Europe a people-Church which stands in the true tradition of the Israel of God. But unhappily another renaissance, and one of a wholly terrestrial nature concentrated on the autonomy of man, is in the very act of conquering the civilised world. Instead of the reconstitution of the people of God we soon see the general decadence of the race. What is alarming is that now the very *idea* of the people of God ceases to be an effective truth. Religion becomes a private affair. The Church becomes a point of assembly for those souls that seek their salvation along individual lines. The people of God ceases to be a people, ceases to have a recognisable identity and to form a solid community. Compare the appalling doctrine of the 17th century: *cuius regio, eius religio*—the prince decides the religion of his subjects—with the conception of a third race! Set the Christian of the primitive community who feels himself the member of a body which is visible as well as invisible beside the 19th century Christian with his refrain "*my* religious convictions and *my* private life concern nobody"! Observe the contradiction between those divided, those *atomised* churches which either ignore each other or quarrel among themselves—and a people united in Christ, among whom the suffering of one member makes all suffer. Consider the distance which separates these bourgeois, solidly planted in a world of strangers, from the colonists of the Kingdom of God of which the New Testament speaks.

Peoples Which Count Themselves Divine

The people of God had vanquished the ancient peoples. They had taught them not to count their own existence as an end in itself and the last word of creation. The presence of this new people—in so far as it was an effective presence—had been a clear warning which proclaimed that the destiny of the ancient peoples depended on the new people far more than its destiny depended upon theirs.

But now there is no more a "new" people in any separate sense. There are only isolated Christians, atomised ecclesiastical institutions, without real inner cohesion, without the sense of belonging to *the* unique community willed by God. There is no longer anything to set against the "fleshly" nations. And so they feel themselves free to occupy all the spiritual inheritance which the new people has abandoned. They ask nothing better than

to turn it to their own gain. They begin to count themselves divine, to consider themselves a holy and eternal people.

One of the first to proclaim the holy character of his people was the German philosopher Fichte in his "Addresses to the German Nation" (1808). He was the spiritual father of the great cloud of witnesses to national religion, to the idolatry of the "Volk". He speaks without circumlocution of "hope in the eternal survival of the people"; he speaks of the genius of his people as the "eternal in which man trusts". And how does he justify his new ideas? By the declaration that "the first Christians might renounce their earthly home, but that man always seeks for heaven on this earth—always desires to impregnate his labour with some quality of permanence". Could it be put more clearly than that, that this national mysticism is in effect the substitute for Christianity and that the German people is set in the place once occupied by the people of God?

However, do not let us suppose that this is a purely German phenomenon. A century later Maurice Barrès writes sentences which echo those of Fichte. He speaks of the worship he gives to "the Earth and the Dead", to the "Eternal France"; and he too confesses: "I have brought down my devotion from heaven to earth, the earth which holds my dead."

Meanwhile the "vacuum", the great spiritual void of the masses has become more and more intolerable. The Church does very little to fill it. It has only a private message to offer the multitudes who need to be reintegrated in an order greater than themselves. It has only religious ideas to offer to men who are hungering and thirsting to be confronted with a reality that is powerful and dynamic. This is not really the Church—the people of God—conscious of belonging to the new creation, and manifesting in its life the unshakable certainty that the world is already vanquished. Need we be astonished that national messianisms gain the ear of the masses and that the doctrines of a holy people become real religions in our day? "The people is the only end that exists," declared the Leader of the German people. "If the peoples perish, the religious ideas which dominate them, perish too." So God depends upon the life of people on this earth. People on this earth are in themselves an end, while God is but a means.

Further, there is nothing surprising in the absolute refusal to tolerate the presence of the people of Israel among the German

people. Are these Jews not a daily reminder that *once and once only* God chose a people of this earth, and that therefore all other peoples are but fugitive and transient? Hence it must be denied that they are a chosen people. It must be denied that they have any mission to fulfil. Hitler says in *Mein Kampf*, "The existence of the Jews is founded on a single great lie—that they represent a religious community: Whereas it is only a question of a race —and what a race!"

In the end it comes to this—that a nation which claims divinity cannot cherish any holy people in its bosom. It must protest against the Church of Jesus Christ. The new ideology which seeks to transform the State into a Church cannot endure the existence of a community which by the mere fact of its existence reminds men that a people in the sense of race can never have the last word, and who will not allow themselves to be absorbed in the totalitarian order. Listen to this recent testimony, called The Soldier's Profession of Faith: "It is in Germany that we put our faith. So we cannot at the same time believe in another Kingdom beyond, because we are called to live for our nation and for our personal happiness. . . . We cannot live by two different faiths. In our hearts there is room for but one faith, one creed: Germany." And inversely: The Church which would remain a Church, can never forget that the *Ecclesia* of God means a people created by and dedicated to God alone which is therefore compelled to protest against the great usurpation by a people according to the flesh of the titles which it has received from God Himself.

The People of God Recovers Its Mission

Two peoples are at war, and there is no possible compromise. Who will be the victor? It is surely not very difficult to answer that question. On the one hand there are the peoples of this world who are fanatically convinced of their mission, marvellously organised and with every instrument of power and propaganda at their command. On the other hand, the people of the Spirit, without the means of imposing its will, and, what is far more serious, without the clear sense it once possessed of the eternal heritage and of the solidarity of its members. The warfare seems uneven.

However, wait a moment! We are talking of the people *of God*; of a people whose history is no mere chain of cause and

effect, but a history of unexpected acts of salvation; of a people which was at the mercy of the Pharaohs when God brought them up out of Egypt; which was threatened with dispersal at the moment of the Exile, and God held them in His hand and later regrouped them; which was later reduced to a single man crucified and laid in the tomb, and then raised and become the firstborn of a new people. In the history of this people appearances are deceptive. The fundamental question is always, What will God do?

Humbly and without boasting we may—indeed, we must—say that in another of those critical and decisive moments of the history of God's people, God is once more reassembling His own. He is setting up once more His dispersed people. Once more He is making of them a *true people.*

In the past, and before the great conflicts between Church and world God began to prepare for this great reassembling. All over the world groups of Christians, weary of their solitude and isolation, set about searching for the Church, and were forced to acknowledge in alarm that the Church in the New Testament sense no longer existed. Was the Church then to be reorganised? No, for that would only mean a careless doctoring of the wounds of the people. A little more local activity of congregations, a little more liturgy, a better system of government, the creation of ecumenical organs—all these mean nothing so long as the people of the Church have not rediscovered the full meaning of their own existence as God's people, people of the new world, a holy people, the body of Christ. Moreover, it is through heavy judgment that the people must once more relearn this ancient lesson.

We cannot understand the meaning of all the events which are taking place about us. We must discern in them the certainty that God is taking action about His people. He does this by reminding them that they belong to the only true new order, the order of the Kingdom of God. He takes from them all false security. He makes His word sound forth in a new way. The Bible lies open among us, and it tells us with authority that our true history is of God's shaping and that His people is its object. He makes His people pass through suffering in order to approach the Cross of His Son. It does not escape His knowledge that the Church is today being persecuted as it has not been persecuted for centuries. We recognise His hand in the present

history of the Church. He is working among us today as He worked in the days of Elijah when He kept for Himself seven thousand who would not bow the knee to Baal, or in the days of Isaiah when He founded a faithful remnant. Yet again God speaks to His people: "I will sift the house of Israel among all nations like as corn is sifted in a sieve." (Amos 9: 9).

Once more God is destroying and building up. He is destroying many things which we thought indispensable for the life of His people. But He is building a militant Church, a free Church. He is proving that the life of the peoples of this earth is perishable, but that the people who are led by Him can never perish. Do we not see that even in the midst of this war the Christians in our divided countries are beginning to realise that their solidarity as the members of *the one people* is more real and deeper than even their solidarity with their fellow countrymen?

This is not the moment for a song of victory. The people of God is still as a body in a state of great weakness. Most of its members are held prisoner by the peoples of this world and do not realise that they belong to the Church of the new creation, and do not live in indestructible communion with their brothers in Christ, of every class and every race. Those who live with their whole being intent upon belonging to this people of a later day, to the victorious people of Christ, are still rare among us. But let us thank God that there are any of them at all, that there are as it were "cells" of the true people among the nations! What a joy to discover that these "cells" are indeed invincible, that the promises of God to His people are true today for all who trust in Him!

Have we enough Christian perspicacity, are we well enough grounded in that *other* history—the history of God—to understand that here we have great reason to hope? Just at the point where the people of God is living like God's people, where they are proclaiming the word of God to the peoples of this world, *there* is the beginning of victory over the great disorder of the world. The order which all the peoples pretend to be seeking comes to birth where men submit to God's order.

In the midst of the chaotic history of our time, the history of God with His people continues. God remains amazingly faithful to His plan. That plan is today the same as what God proclaimed to His people at the beginning of their history: "And I . . . will be your God and ye shall be my people." (Lev. 26: 12).

The Church in Mining and Urban Centres in Africa

Margaret Wrong

Ideals for the post-war world are being formulated in general terms. The next step is to discover what has to be done to realise them in particular situations. Only by so doing can the reality of the task be faced. Church leaders of the Roman Catholic, Anglican and Free Church Communion in England in a letter to *The Times* newspaper of December 21st, 1940, endorsed the following five standards (originally formulated at the International Conference on Church, Community and State held in 1937) by which economic situations and proposals may be tested:—

Five Standards

1. Extreme inequality in wealth and possessions should be abolished;
2. Every child, regardless of race or class, should have equal opportunities of education suitable for the development of his peculiar capacities;
3. The family as a social unit must be safeguarded;
4. The sense of a Divine vocation must be restored to man's daily work;
5. The resources of the earth should be used as God's gifts to the whole human race, and used with due consideration for the needs of the present and future generations.

The purpose of this article is to look at the task of the Church in Africa in urban and mining centres in the light of these standards.

New Importance of Money

All over Africa today a money economy is taking the place of old systems of exchange of goods and services and desire for and need of money is evident even in remote villages. Money is required for taxes, for school fees, for clothing, bicycles and other commodities not produced locally. If the means of earning money does not exist in the immediate neighbourhood young men go off to seek their fortunes elsewhere. In parts of Africa

—notably in east, central and south—the migration of numbers of young men to work in mines and European towns is disintegrating the rural economy. The Belgian Government has estimated that if more than 10 per cent. of the able-bodied men are away from the villages there is deterioration of rural life and agriculture. But in Northern Rhodesia in many districts 50 per cent. of the men are away, and in Northern Nyasaland over 50 per cent. are absent from home. In West Africa migration is less extensive and rural life does not suffer the same degree of dislocation for the population is larger and in some areas local markets offer more opportunity for buying and selling; there are also more valuable export crops and, in fertile parts, greater agricultural possibilities.

Africa is part of a world economy and her peoples—like agricultural peoples elsewhere—are affected by variations in world prices. Discussing the poverty of African farmers in Northern Nigeria an official said, "If the price of ground nuts could be stabilised at £7 to £8 a ton the low standard of life of the African farmers in these parts could be raised." Prices fixed by combines of European buyers have caused deep-seated dissatisfaction among African growers. In 1937-38, for instance, Gold Coast farmers organised a hold-up of the cocoa crop and refused to dispose of it at the price offered.

Low Level of Subsistence

Agriculturally, Africa is not a rich continent and many of the rural people live at a low level of subsistence agriculture. There are huge areas of desert; there are great tracts which are short of water; the fertility of much of the soil is limited and erosion is a continent-wide menace. An indication of the agricultural poverty of the continent, taken as a whole, is furnished by the estimated population of about 110,000,000. Yet the continent is greater in area than Europe, India, China and the United States put together. The sparse population in many parts is undoubtedly due to limited fertility. That fertility can be increased by the application of scientific knowledge is true, but even so agricultural possibilities should not be over-estimated.

African farmers in many areas who are able to produce export crops are unable to market them owing to lack of transport. In Northern and Southern Rhodesia, for instance,

except in some restricted districts marketing is impossible because of lack of roads and rail for transportation of crops. The making of roads by local authorities to connect villages and so promote local exchange of goods has benefited some areas, as has the establishment of local markets. One Mission in Nyasaland, for instance, has organised a market on mission property which is attended one day a week by 2,000 to 3,000 people and serves a radius of 20 miles. A local chief has followed suit in organising a similar market at his headquarters. But an examination of maps shows that in most areas the planning of main lines of communication has been dictated mainly by export of mineral wealth, produce of large plantations and military necessity rather than for internal exchange between African producers or the export of their crops. Thus the establishment of a money economy and lack of local opportunity to make money are factors in encouraging migration to mining and urban centres.

Appropriation of Land

Another reason for migration in areas of permanent white settlement is appropriation of land by Europeans to such an extent that it is necessary for the African population to work for wages outside the areas allotted to them. In South Africa, for instance, 87 per cent. of the area of the Union is reserved for less than 2½ million Europeans, leaving 13 per cent. for 7½ million Africans.

The full extent of the mineral resources of Africa is unknown and the development of these resources by Europeans is only the most recent chapter in a story which goes back into the remote past. But this chapter is having a profound effect on the life of African peoples, particularly in East, Central and South Africa. The European owned and managed mines want labour and the African as has been shown wants money which he cannot obtain locally, hence the migration to mining centres. In addition to the mines European urban centres want African labour for a variety of services as do European owned and managed plantations and farms.

The Church's Part in Social Change

Though missionaries deplore excessive migration from country districts to seek employment in mines and towns, the work of the Church encourages such migration by creating new

demands and desires in the people, by spreading education and encouraging higher standards of life and by emphasising the importance of human personality and initiative. The Christian Church up and down the continent has been one pioneer in education and today some 85 per cent. of the educational work south of the Sahara is under the control of Christian bodies. All this encourages discontent with limited opportunities for social and economic advance.

The work of Christian Missions in Africa used to be carried on in remote districts and in isolation from outside influences. The problems faced were those of Christianising tribal peoples and in this effort no small measure of success was achieved. Today such isolation is a thing of the past. The Church is faced with the impact of a non-Christian Western world on African peoples whose tribal life is being broken by this impact. This impact is felt in the villages as well as at the mines and in the towns and the war is increasing this process. Whether in country or in town the Church faces social and economic questions due to this impact.

It is obvious that the Church must go with the people who migrate to the mines and towns. The sense of this need is growing among African Christians. An African from Nyasaland who is teaching in a mining compound in Southern Rhodesia writes: "We are very grateful now because two Nyasaland Native ministers were sent to visit us in this country. They spent a whole month walking to and from towns and mines. The work which they did is very good. We said, 'Our fathers have come to see us, their children.' *They* said, 'From now we know your troubles here.'" Rural African churches are beginning to send their own church workers into mining areas.

Increasing thought is being given to the task of the Christian Mission in these areas and to the staffing of the work. Large congregations gather in churches in urban centres. For instance in Leopoldville, Belgian Congo, successive services in a number of African languages are held in one large church and are attended by packed congregations.

Life and Work in Mining Areas

Work in mining and urban centres presents many problems. There is often little or no provision for family life. At the gold mines of the Rand men live together in great compounds and

are cut off from normal family life for long periods. At the Copper Mines of Northern Rhodesia and at West African mines provision for families is limited. The Belgian government is making provision for a permanent industrialised population at the mines in that territory. But in all mining and European urban centres there is casual labour. Tribal ties are weakened, parents complain that they lose control of their children and that the young people no longer have respect for the old; that, in short, the social foundations on which society has been built are weakened, and giving way.

Housing is frequently such that a decent family life is impossible. In one municipal compound, accommodation for African workers consists of cells about 7½ feet square made of brick with low iron roofs. These cells are infested with vermin and ventilation comes principally from the door. Protests appear in the African press about bad housing conditions in many areas. The Church has a large field of activity here in developing a public opinion which will insist on increased municipal expenditure on decent quarters for African workers in urban areas and in seeking to foster decent standards of life in those communities made up of people of many tribes.

It is cheering to note that today a growing conscience about housing is evident in a number of municipalities. Good work in town planning has been done by both French and Belgian authorities, a determined effort is being made to tackle the slum conditions in many South African townships, and several South African municipalities have built new housing estates at considerable expenditure—but much remains to be done.

Sunday afternoon in some African townships gives the impression that the dominant standards of many of the African inhabitants are those of the low-grade European life by which they are often surrounded. An American missionary nurse doing welfare work in a township outside Johannesburg calls Sunday the "gory day" for it is the day after pay day, drunkenness is widespread and brawls, assaults and stabbings result. As an aftermath of Sunday there are many cases before the courts on Monday morning.

Bantu Family Life

Recently the Christian Council of South Africa held a conference on African family life. Papers given on this occasion analysed social and economic conditions affecting the family and

placed poverty high in the causes of disintegration of the family under urban conditions. An African Christian leader in a paper given at the Conference said:

"The Bantu family is becoming a mere labour unit for the production of cheap labour under starvation wages. Because of labour demands the head of the family must be away from his family for much longer periods than those spent with the family. In most families both men and women have to work at the same time. . . . Many families are daily broken up because of some of these things."

Investigations on wage-rates in urban areas in South Africa give the average wage of Africans working in towns as £4. 5s. to £5. 5s. a month and the minimum cost of living for a family of five as £6. 10s. to £8 a month. This means that other members of the family must work or steal to make up the difference.

There is evidence of growing dissatisfaction on the part of African workers with regard to wage rates in many areas. During disturbances on the Copper Belt in 1940 African workers raised the issue of equal pay for equal work and challenged the mine management to allow them to work a competitive shift against the Europeans in order to demonstrate their ability.

An African in Kenya Colony writes in a local paper:

"Modern education has undeniably brought about a standard of civilisation among the Africans which calls strongly for a departure from that primitive state to a higher level of living and thinking and to be able to respond to this irresistible call . . . an adequate income is necessary . . . our salaries are inadequate."

Growth of Labour Organisation

That in order to improve conditions African wage earners require organisation for collective bargaining is widely recognised. The principle of African Trade Unions has been endorsed by the British Colonial Office and Labour Officers with trade union experience have been appointed in several African territories. In South Africa, African trade unions are spreading.

On the other hand, in areas of White settlement, White labour in Africa is fearful of competition from Black labour, and to prevent this an economic colour bar is legally enforced in South Africa, is operative in Southern Rhodesia and is increasingly practised in Northern Rhodesia. By this means

skilled occupations are reserved for Europeans and wage rates are determined by the colour of the skin, not by ability.

In addition to the organisation of African labour the development of co-operatives is urged. Various forms of co-operatives have been encouraged by both French and British Governments but the movement is still in an early stage. The chequered history of many co-operative ventures shows that education in the principle of co-operation is essential for success. The founding of local industries accelerated by the war which limits so many imports presents the Church with special opportunities to foster co-operatives in Africa today.

United Christian Effort Required

The need for united Christian effort in planning and carrying out work in African mining and urban areas is increasingly recognised by many Christian communions. To these centres come people of many churches and of none. They cannot be effectively ministered to without united effort. In Northern Rhodesia five Christian Missions are co-operating in the "United Missions in the Copper Belt" in a programme of educational, social and evangelistic work to which the government is giving support and is meeting the cost of educational work undertaken through the United Missions. The staff of the co-operating Missions includes 13 Europeans, a number of African teachers, pastors and other workers. This development may well provide a pattern for similar work in other areas.

The training of African Christian leadership is both a need and an opportunity. A school for the training of African Social Workers has been set up under Christian auspices in Johannesburg. The Christian Church has taken the lead in the training of African nurses and it is due to that pioneer effort that African public health nurses are available today for work in African townships in South Africa. There are many other branches of training for community and social work in which the Church has been the pioneer.

An African Methodist minister formulates the following claims for himself and his people in a South African journal. He asks for the opening up and enlarging of their mental outlook through religion and education, and that they may be treated as human beings with the political and economic rights, obligations and responsibilities that belong to human beings. He

claims freedom of thought, of speech, of movement, freedom of assembly and of association as well as of collective bargaining in connection with the sale of their labour. He asks that there may be no discrimination in the administration of justice, and that they may share in the benefits of the country's social services.

A young African administrative officer of the Gold Coast speaking of the task of the Christian Church says it is necessary to think of the Church as a dynamic force for the building of a new society.

It is clear that in its work in mining and urban centres in Africa the Church is faced with economic and social issues of the first magnitude. The five standards quoted at the beginning of this article furnish a measuring stick for situations to be faced. These situations can only be faced effectively if there is a burning conviction that people of all races are members of one community in which they share both responsibility and opportunity. The vision of Christendom is of a community which includes and binds men of every race together as members of one body in which all are responsible moral beings under God.

The Church and the Swedish S.C.M.

YNGVE FRYKHOLM

There are perhaps few countries where the Student Christian Movement is more closely connected with the Church than Sweden. This is not a matter of organisation but a specific conception of the Church, of its spiritual traditions and scope.

When the General Secretary of our Federation asked me to write something for THE STUDENT WORLD, I was not quite sure whether the heading given above would be of very real interest to our Christian fellow-students in various parts of the world. Does our peculiar situation in Sweden have any relevance whatever to the tremendous problems facing the majority of our Federation members these days? However I was persuaded that there may perhaps be some points raised in this connection which could be of some use as a contribution for further discussion. At the same time, this will bring up some more questions which were dealt with at the small Federation gathering at Présinge near Geneva.

The S.C.M. is Church-minded

The Swedish S.C.M. is definitely church-minded. This is a historical fact based on the revival of church-consciousness among the academic youth at the beginning of this century, rather inadequately translated as the Young Church Movement. During a period of crisis and struggle, when the official church tradition was knocked about by natural science and liberal theology, a small group of Christian student leaders at the University of Uppsala set hearts aflame with love and faith in the divine calling of the National Church of Sweden. The Swedish S.C.M. was backed up and guided by prominent young theologians, who laid down a solid theological basis for an Evangelical Lutheran Church conception, which particularly stresses the idea of the Church as the revelation and realisation of the prevenient grace of God.[1] Into this community we were born and baptised, and, without waiting to consider our religious

[1] A full account of this historical development has been given in an article by Arnold Werner, appearing in the Second Quarter of THE STUDENT WORLD, 1932.

sentiments and decisions, our Swedish Church offers us all, generously, and without discrimination, its divine inheritance of spiritual guidance and comfort and fellowship.

All this is still the main trend of the S.C.M. approach to the church tradition in Sweden. This gives our Movement a strength and firmness, which we badly need during these days of upheaval. At the same time, however, we realise the danger of becoming nationally short-sighted, of losing the ecumenical outlook by tying ourselves up within the frame of a purely national church tradition.

There are obviously many strong points in this keen feeling of being an organic part of the Church, which is one of the guiding principles of the Swedish S.C.M.

At a time when Christian students all over the world are struggling to find a foothold for their religious thinking on a basis which is neither totalitarianism nor clear-cut individualism, their Swedish friends have a solid church tradition to which they all feel they belong. The S.C.M. is a member of this Church, with particular student responsibilities and specific lines of action, but nevertheless just a member of the National Church of Sweden. We would hardly consider it possible to lead our own life, separately from the Church.

For example, we should have much less courage to evangelise our fellow-students if we did not have this solid frame of church tradition and fellowship to show them into. We saw how secularised students, who were miraculously won for Christian faith and discipline by hard-working courageous "Oxford teams" some years ago, faded away when left alone, because they were never rooted down in a church community, which remains when individual sources of spiritual support are no more available.

There is also a great strength for the Swedish S.C.M. in having the constant guidance and aid of leading churchmen and theologians in the university towns. This close and living contact between the church leaders and the Christian students is of a double value. In giving the students guidance and support, it helps our church leaders, at the same time, to keep their minds awake to the religious problems of the present student generation.

Tradition of Church a Strength in War

Moreover, in these days, when we so often feel the strain of being geographically cut off from the world student Christian

fellowship, it is an added source of comfort to feel that the ecumenical ideals which our Movement stands for are also being carried out by a Church which is marked by strong ecumenical traditions.

However I do not think that our S.C.M. church-consciousness is merely a matter of passively *receiving* spiritual support and guidance through our Church. We also sincerely believe that, as Christian students, we have very particular opportunities to convey to this Church of ours certain fresh impulses of new religious life. I hope I shall be able to show further on that the relationship is one of fruitful co-operation, a matter of generous give and take, from which our Church too is bound to draw great benefits.

As pointed out above, all these are great advantages, as long as we do not relax within a passively narrow-minded church attitude. But I think I may say that most of us are keenly aware that our privileged position of being rooted in a common religious soil places before us huge responsibilities. We know that we must always be alert to the risk that our church-mindedness may be transformed into a kind of self-satisfied church nationalism, which forgets that a Christian Church is a border-transcending Church.

And believe me, this peculiar situation of ours has accordingly brought us to face very peculiar problems which must be tackled in their own specific ways. The fact that the Swedish S.C.M. primarily approaches such students who feel chiefly at home in the National Church, rather than covering all Christian students in general, has created the situation that, beside the National Church S.C.M. we have a strong minority in a Free Church S.C.M.

Separate Trends Within the Movement

Both of us belong to the Federation, and of course we are mostly good friends. We have several activities in common, we hold various meetings which are jointly organised, and we have a joint national committee. These very days an added tendency towards collaboration is reported from Uppsala. But nevertheless, our different church conceptions keep us apart in our main lines of action within the universities. Moreover, it is greatly to be feared that the very recent tendencies towards a further strengthening of the church-consciousness, on both sides, within

the National Church as well as among the Free Churches of Sweden, will increase the difference of principles between the two branches of the S.C.M.

There is no denying that this peculiar situation in Sweden opens up evident lines of danger. Speaking from the student point of view, the main risk is that our separation is an obstacle for our fellow students who are standing outside. Furthermore, our general ecumenical outlook and our feeling of belonging to a world-wide student Christian fellowship must obviously be hampered by our not being united in a common action among our non-Christian fellow students.

At the Federation meeting at Présinge, the troublesome question was raised whether our close relations to the Church would not be another obstacle for the "outsiders" to enter the S.C.M. This is probably so. Some years ago, our efforts were chiefly concentrated on student evangelisation. But since then, an acute need for spiritual solidness and authority has once more focussed a major part of our programmes and activities on the Church. I only hope that this is another matter of rhythmic change between giving and receiving of spiritual impulses. There is certain evidence from Uppsala that the scales are turning again towards student evangelisation.

And after all, we must not forget that the personal Christian approach to fellow students is something which cannot be marked down in reports and statistics of an S.C.M. in action.

But let me also tell you that we are keenly aware of our peculiar student responsibilities and opportunities within the Churches to which we belong. This is true both for the National Church S.C.M. and for its Free Church fellow movement.

The Student as Member of a Church

Since the academic church revival of 1909 and 1910, we have had various student volunteer groups in action within the church communities, eager to serve their Church not only as loyal parishioners but as Christian *students*. Numerous young people have devoted their spare time for work as Christian youth leaders, as Sunday School teachers, as members of touring church choirs and as youthful preachers. And here, of course, our Free Church fellow-students have similar opportunities within their particular scope of action. All this may seem somewhat one-sided, but after all, a Christian student is sooner

or later bound to turn out as a Christian citizen within a certain church community. Therefore we consider it rather important that an S.C.M. member who leaves his university should not only feel at home in his future church and parish, but also be nourished with a strong devotion to the Christian community in which he is one day going to be planted. His contribution, either as a layman or as a clergyman, may perhaps make all the difference.

At our last national winter conference the predominant heading for all the questions dealt with was "Tradition and Renewal within the Church". This main theme sums up rather adequately the principal aim and calling of the S.C.M., considered from the Swedish point of view. At the same time, this is a task which I think all Christian students could have in common. As the intellectual Christian youth of our Churches, we are given the great responsibility of keeping the relation fresh and clear between the two fundamental issues, tradition and renewal within the Church; of accepting with grateful humbleness the inheritance of spiritual firmness and authority of church tradition. (There has already been so much of modern and "clever" church criticism among Christian people.) But also, and above all, it is our task to be the youthful and daring pioneers of constant church renewal.

In Sweden some of us perhaps have a tendency to go too far back in search of church authority and tradition. These recent years a "high church" liturgical movement has won the hearts of many Christian students. These young people feel that they are rediscovering sacred grounds of solid Christian realities within the realm of old liturgical customs. We others accuse them from time to time of losing their sense of responsibility towards their Christian fellow-students as well as the general outlook on a world-wide student Christian community. At the same time, we cannot deny their honest efforts to lead aimless and uprooted souls into their strong and wonderfully disciplined fellowship of devotional action.

Our Calling as Christian Students

In these days, most Christian students have a keen sense of the importance of the opposite issue mentioned; the constant need for repentance and renewal in the life of the Church. Now, more than ever before, it is our duty to act as a kind of living

conscience, always sensitive to the divine calling of our Churches. Obviously, however, we cannot do this without a personal need of our own for daily repentance and forgiveness. One of the church leaders in Holland recently said that a more regrettable thing could hardly be imagined than a Church coming out of the present crisis without having undergone a fundamental renewal. I think the Swedish S.C.M. feels that this saying is true for our privileged Church too. This however clearly points out our calling as Christian students to act and to stand for that spirit of fellowship with the suffering Churches of Europe, which alone can lead our Church into the way of repentance and renewal.

This implies that we still have the great task to act as ecumenical pioneers within our Swedish Church. A wide outlook on a suffering world and on the "ecclesia militans" of Jesus Christ is a particular responsibility which goes with our upbringing within a World's Student Christian Federation. It has always been and will probably always be a specific student calling to uphold the border-transcending tendencies of the Christian Church.

Hand in hand with our ecumenical task, therefore, goes our world missionary calling. Speaking of present conditions in Sweden, I need only say that wherever a missionary student group is in action there are no difficulties whatever in bringing together Christian students of the most widely different church tendencies. The academic missionary conferences have always been the most truly ecumenical enterprises within our Swedish S.C.M.

By all this I have tried to show that the Swedish S.C.M., in spite of its famous church-consciousness, sincerely strives to avoid being merely a reflection of the traditional religious thinking within the Church. On the contrary, we feel that our position gives us great opportunities and responsibilities to keep our Church constantly fresh with new impulses of action and renewal. In Sweden, as well as in other countries, there are numerous church leaders who have received their ecumenical and missionary outlook through the S.C.M. and the Federation. We can only imagine what all this has meant for the Church as a whole.

The Student and the World Today

As to the present world crisis, I may also say that the Swedish S.C.M. has honestly approached the problems to the best of its ability, from its comparatively secluded spot. It is not even too much to say that the S.C.M. has partly taken the lead in tackling some of the burning questions of future reconstruction and of the tremendous responsibilities already given to Sweden and its Christian Churches. For example, the president of the Swedish S.C.M. has published a book on "Law and Morality", which is another problem of grave concern among Christian people in Sweden just now.

The question raised in the introduction to this article was this: Has the peculiar church-consciousness of the Swedish S.C.M. any bearing on the present situation of crisis and suffering? I hope the answer to this has partly been given above. If, one day, we shall be given the tremendous task to heal some of the bleeding wounds of mankind, this will probably be done within the realm of a united church action. This is why I feel that, after all, some of the questions raised above may perhaps not be entirely irrelevant to future reconstruction.

As Christian students, we cannot escape taking our stand and deciding what part we are to play within the actual life of the Church. Of course, this question of church attitude will have to be approached and solved in greatly different ways, owing to peculiar circumstances from one country to the other.

I would not dream of suggesting that the Swedish S.C.M. is facing the problem in a model way. On the contrary, we are deeply aware of our feebleness and shortcomings, the more so in view of our miraculously privileged position. However, I have only wanted to tell you that we are, in our own way, trying to "think ahead as Christians", that we too are looking ahead towards the common glorious goal of the Church of Jesus Christ.

"Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." (Phil. 3: 12.)

The War and the Church in Britain

H. G. G. Herklots

What the War has done to the Church is something that cannot be known at all fully at the present time. The historian of the future will be able to see these things in a better perspective than is possible to those who are actually participating in the swiftly changing life of today. What follows has inevitably this limitation. It has the limitation also of being written by one whose experience is of civilian life and who only knows by hearsay the life of the Forces, in which so many of the younger members of the Church are now engaged, and from which in the future so much new life may spring.

The War has had upon the life of the Church effects of two different types. For the most part it has heightened tendencies which were already apparent in the years between the wars; it has also released new forces, brought about certain new combinations of circumstances and brought into prominence factors which had been neglected for decades if not for centuries. Thus the effects of the air-raids, and of the evacuation of children and businesses were on the whole to undermine the parochial system still further, and to disrupt the settled life of congregations even more violently than it had already been disrupted by modern means of transport. (The cessation of modern means of transport has had its own odd consequences; in some towns clergy have been known to protest against the taking off of Sunday buses which prevent congregations attending the church of their choice. No doubt when Sunday buses were first introduced their predecessors protested against this desecration of the Sabbath!) On the other hand the position of leadership achieved by certain faithful clergy in heavily raided areas was something that England had not known for many years past.

Christian Unity in Action

The pressure towards unity between the denominations, already apparent in the inter-war period, has received strong support from the necessities of war. At the same time among

a significant minority of younger Church members there has developed a new interest in the historic position and beliefs of the denominations to which they belong. There is a strong revulsion from what has been called a "mushy undenominationalism" and a new interest in dogmatic statements of faith. Yet this is not usually antagonistic to the movement for co-operation; it is rather an insistence that co-operation should be informed and purposive.

The formation in the autumn of 1942 of the British Council of Churches has provided machinery for new co-operative action. It has grown out of the previously existing organs of interchurch co-operation—the Commission of the Churches for International Friendship and Social Responsibility, the Council on the Christian Faith and the Common Life, and the British Section of the Faith and Order Movement—and it will be understood that the simplicity of its title is extremely welcome. It works at the moment through four Departments, and a number of committees. The Social Responsibility Department prepared the important statement *Social Justice and Economic Reconstruction* which has been very widely discussed on both sides of the Atlantic. It is prosecuting two other enquiries, one on Rural Reconstruction and the other on The Home and Family Life. In practical ways it is responsible for chaplaincies to munitions works and hostels—a new type of ministry that may well have important developments in the future. The International Friendship Department has also produced its document, *The Christian Church and World Order,* which, like the earlier one, was fully discussed, not by the Department only, but by the whole Commission of the Churches, one of the present Council's predecessors. The principal practical task that the Department has undertaken has been the creation and co-ordination of a number of Fellowships that link British Christians with foreign Christians who are now in this country. Thus, for example, the Scandinavian one includes Norwegian, Danish, Swedish and Finnish, as well as British members, representatives of allied, neutral and enemy nations. A general committee links these different Fellowships together; and their short Retreat Conferences, at which as many as fifteen different nationalities may be represented, recreate something of the atmosphere of pre-war ecumenical gatherings. There are few centres of population of any size in Great Britain which have not now within them a

certain number of refugees from Europe, and some sense of the World Church is being forced upon many British Christians today.

Religion and Life Weeks

The ecumenical movement in England has been popularised by a series of Religion and Life Weeks held up and down the country. These began at Bristol in the autumn of 1940, and since then have spread with an infectious rapidity that is almost embarrassing to those who are responsible for their planning. In 1943 there will be more of them than ever. Weeks have been held in centres varying in size from great cities such as Manchester to small country towns such as Hertford. Their original idea was that of practical demonstrations which would bring home the reality of the Universal Church, and the thought of the Oxford Conference of 1937, to the ordinary man in the pew, and to the ordinary man who had not been in a pew for years. This modern method of evangelism endeavours to reach, not the individual in his solitariness, but the individual in the complex set of relationships that makes up so much of his life. Indeed "the local community regarded as a corporate whole" is described as the *target* of the week. Thus a night will be given to the Home, another to the School, another to Commerce and Industry, another to the World of Nations, and another to the Universal Church. The intention is that in all these spheres men should be called to that re-thinking which is a prime factor in repentance, and that, in relationship to all these themes, the essential Christian Gospel should be stated. The large meetings have not been very successful in reaching outsiders; it is in the smaller sectional meetings (for teachers, doctors, etc.) that this has been done much more often. The meetings for senior forms of secondary schools have been particularly useful, and provocative of many questions. Everywhere the Weeks have stimulated study and prayer on inter-denominational lines of a type to which students have long been accustomed, but which is new to most English Christians who have not known College life. And many new councils have been set up which reproduce, in a local setting, the general pattern of the British Council of Churches.

Interconfessional Co-operation

The Religion and Life movement has provided an opportunity for a certain limited co-operation with the Sword of the Spirit, a movement within the Roman Catholic Church which has received the powerful support of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Very often, where a Religion and Life Week is being held, there will be a simultaneous Mission in the Roman Catholic churches of the town, and co-operation with the Week at one or two special meetings. The formula to describe this is "parallel action in the religious, and joint action in the social and international sphere". It is easy to make too much of the unity which has thus been achieved. But it is a beginning where, a few years ago, no sort of a beginning seemed possible. The Joint Committee, representing Religion and Life (under the British Council of Churches) and the Sword of the Spirit has put out a Statement on Co-operation which includes this important paragraph on religious freedom:

"We agree that organised Christianity, to fulfil its proper function, must everywhere be secured in certain essential freedoms. Full freedom must mean freedom to worship according to conscience, freedom to preach, teach, educate and persuade (all in the spirit of Christian charity), and freedom to bring up children in the faith of their parents. The Christian life is one lived in and through membership of a religious society, and its corporate nature and its constitutional freedom and independence must be recognised and guaranteed by the State."

In this Joint Committee complete frankness has been achieved: there are no questions that are carefully put on one side as too difficult. And it is surely a new thing that in the town where I live study groups in the different Churches—Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Free—are working on the same syllabus and meeting together every six weeks to compare their findings.

Church and Government in the Service of Youth

Further co-operative developments in the life of the Church have sprung from the new interest that the Government has taken in the young people of the country, and through the new claims that it is making upon them. In the past, the great majority of boys and girls have left school at fourteen, and after that the organised community has taken almost no interest in them. Youth organisations were voluntary affairs, most of them

being founded on a Christian basis, and many of them having a very close association with the different denominations. All saw the need for fresh action, but most were afraid lest there should be established in our country some national youth movement of a quasi-totalitarian kind. That danger has been avoided. The new Service of Youth was not placed under the War Office but under the Board of Education, which was thus successful in making a claim that the welfare of all young people up to the age of twenty is fundamentally an educational concern. It has been the definite policy of the Board, carried out with a varying degree of faithfulness by Local Education Authorities up and down the country, in the first place to strengthen the work that the voluntary organisations are doing, and then to supplement that work where necessary. This typically English compromise is set out in one of the Board's Circulars in this way:

"Any attempt at a State-controlled uniformity or regimentation would be both stupid and perilous; more than that, it would be wholly alien to the spirit of this country. The function of the State in this work is to focus and lead the efforts of all engaged in Youth Welfare; to supplement the resources of existing national organisations without impairing their independence; and to ensure through co-operation that the ground is covered in a way never so far attained."

As a result all the great national youth organisations (excluding those of a party political nature) have received grants in aid from public funds; and many church youth groups fearful at first of a new type of competition have found that instead they have entered into a new partnership with the community as a whole, which recognised for the first time the significance of the work that they were doing.

Thus there has been a new stimulus to the denominations to make their youth work efficient, and to do much more of it together. A secondary result has been an emphasis upon the distinctive contribution of Christian groups—that preparation for discipleship and apostleship which is the very reason for their existence. It is realised that when the country is asking great things of its youth, the Church should not be content only to ask little things. Up and down the country united Christian youth councils of different types have been formed, very often in the first place for immediate tactical reasons—perhaps to get the right people on the local Youth Committee—but usually also

with some glimpse of the larger strategy that it is only a World Church that can meet the world's needs. On a national scale the Youth Department of the British Council of Churches endeavours to assist and to deepen all these new co-operative ventures. It is recognised by the Board of Education as the body through which it can most conveniently consult the Churches on matters relating to the Service of Youth, and it receives aid from the Board towards the salary of one of its secretaries. It keeps the Churches informed of new developments, supplies study material that interprets to youth the thought of the British Council of Churches, and endeavours in every way possible to set forward the great aim of the Amsterdam Conference from which it took its origin: "We believe that a truly just and ordered society will be only built by those who have surrendered their wills to God, who seek to clarify their vision, and who train and discipline themselves to live every day as members of the Christian community."

The Church Goes to the People

This account has spoken much of new organisation and new machinery. But it may well be asked: is there new life? That is much more difficult to assess, for it cannot be weighed in human balances. Sometimes it seems that there is more cause for encouragement outside rather than inside the Church. Certainly many thinking people, whose philosophy in the past has been a humanistic one, have now been persuaded that the claims of Christianity must be taken seriously, to be accepted or rejected, and not merely left on one side as irrelevant. (To great masses however their lack of relevance has only been emphasised by the war.) There seems also to be a real determination that Christian teaching shall in the future be given much more thoroughly in all the schools. The fact that the last national day of prayer was held on a week-day evoked a new kind of response. Working folk were almost startled to see the Church going to people—in barns and factories and offices—rather than hearing the wearisome reiteration with which the people have so often been bidden to go to Church. At the present moment the leadership of the Archbishop of Canterbury stands out in a remarkable way; a bigger crowd will probably assemble to hear him than to hear any speaker except the Prime Minister. Within all the denominations there are many prepared to follow

the lead that he is giving, and some at least who are hoping that it will point much more obviously towards actual reunion than it has done as yet. Something of a Christian public opinion is forming in Great Britain, which may in the future become a political factor of importance; this owes much to Dr. Oldham's *Christian News-Letter*. But few of these things will avail very much unless we are prepared to take God a great deal more seriously than we have done as yet. Perhaps through the deepening experience of suffering that must still lie ahead for us, we shall be cleansed from self-satisfaction, and a new, stark and courageous Christianity will be born.

THE EDITOR'S TRAVEL DIARY

Out to the West

In October I made a rapid tour across the United States to California. I saw people skiing at a high pass in Colorado, and then came down to a second summer in Los Angeles. For ten days I travelled through orange groves from one beautiful college campus to another. One night I spent above the clouds in the mountains which stand like scenery on a stage behind the rich medley of old Spain and modern America lying between them and the sea. I looked longingly through the Golden Gate to the untraversable Pacific, beyond which were so many friends in the Far East, impossible to reach, or even hear about, in these days of war. Then I turned my feet north to Canada and my thoughts to Europe.

My tour was largely concerned with the World Student Service Fund, and I had the impression that the challenge to raise $300,000 for distress amongst fellow students in East and West was being taken very seriously. On the West Coast the internment of students of Japanese race has brought a new understanding of how misfortune may fall upon the innocent, and it was deeply moving to be thanked by a Japanese-American student now in Nebraska for the release to continue his studies which the action of his fellow-students had effected. I must not write at length of American student life, since the great changes occasioned by the demands of national service have already reduced the value of my impressions. But I left a regional S.C.M. Council meeting strangely assured that if I could cross the Atlantic it would be partly as the ambassador to my own country of students in a country not my own.

And Back to the East

There is no university situation in the world so beautiful as that of the University of British Columbia. Happy are they who can study with blue water and tree-clad, snow-capped mountains all around them! The B.C. students are singularly forbearing towards one who has only visited them twice for a day "en route", but they have the outlook of men at a gateway and are conscious of what is happening in the world, and of the Federation. Then I crossed the Canadian Rockies for the first time, and found them far less

forbidding, and far more romantic than the railway posters! I don't know whether I enjoyed more seeing bison and elk in the national park or Australian airmen experiencing the joys of a snow-fight. I was proud of the clockwork regularity of the trains (until we encountered a fall of rock on the track!) for it confirmed my impression of the magnificent way in which Canada handles its great traffic of men and materials for war across a continent.

I stopped off at Winnipeg, and had the same sense of being in the centre of things, not only geographically but in world-wide interest, which had come to me in 1940. Canadian S.C.M. branches always seem able to secure the direct interest of the President of the university in a Federation visitor, which gives the news he carries greater significance, and lifts a few hours of discussion into the setting of an international exchange. And so back to Toronto for a few hurried days of clearing-up.

Sailing Orders

They came as sealed orders. I set off at half a day's notice for an "Eastern Canadian port" to board an unnamed vessel for an unnamed port. There I was asked to sign a document which, so far as I was able to discover, absolved the shipping company from any responsibilities to land me anywhere in any condition. Having done that I found that the most meticulous care was taken of my unworthy person until I set foot on English soil. The arrangement put me in a most happy relationship to the ship; I was received on board a sturdy Newfoundland freighter as a friend whom she was willing to take for company, so long as I gave her my allegiance and affection through the heavy seas of December. I never felt so proud of my ship, or more grateful for any experience.

As I stood on the quay trying to figure out the personalities of nine fellow-passengers, one of them said to me: "Yes, it was in Kyushu that we met, when you spoke to the students." There it was again—that persistent Federation, which will never leave me, even on an Atlantic crossing, outside the range of its fellowship. He turned out to be my cabin-mate, and when the chief steward greeted us, he did not desert me. This was an act of great courage for the greeting was: "So you're the parson! Well the last time we carried a parson we sank!" But I comforted myself that I was going to Britain in the service of the Federation, and did not offer to look for a whale! How the passengers became a real community because there was no space to do otherwise, and how all the games learnt in Freshers' Socials came in handy for our entertainment, there is no space to recount. But twice we worshipped God, crew and passengers together, singing Christmas hymns with great joy to the

accompaniment of an accordion. Here was faith which humbled me as I realised that all the men would be out on dangerous seas again while I was eating my Christmas dinner in Scotland.

Religion and Life

It was a privilege to be shepherded by the destroyers and corvettes of four nations, to be covered by the wings of planes from unknown northern bases, to be guarded by men whose job it was to man the guns of any ship that came into port wherever it might take them, and to be served with cheerful faithfulness by two score men from the towns and villages of Canada and Great Britain, who had that utter readiness to lose all which is supposed to characterise the Christian. I realised once again how hard it is for a rich man, yes, rich in the consolations of religious work, to enter the kingdom.

Many things helped me to understand my faith better. Why should tough seamen bring Christmas trees amongst a sterner cargo, and spend the scanty hours off duty making children's toys? Why should men running the risks of a freighter be so quick in their praise for the men whom no one knows, who man the tankers? Why should British sailors go out of their way to comment on what it must take in the way of courage to cross the Atlantic in a hostile submarine? Such questions suddenly made sense when I caught the likeness of a naval rating on the watch to a monk at his prayers. There he stood silhouetted in his rough coat with the hood hanging over his shoulders and a rope for his girdle. I followed his gaze and saw the little rescue ship fighting its way back over the swell after an errand of mercy, showing only its foremast above the waves, and that in the form of a cross. They may not say in these days, like the Elizabethan mariner, "We are as near heaven by sea as by land", but they live like men who believe it.

"England's Green and Pleasant Land"

It was raining, and that was delightful; but almost immediately it was black dark, and that was a shock to the homecomer. At first I felt that after three years' absence everything would be hopelessly strange; then I found that everyone talked to me as if I had only been round the corner, and so I felt as if I had never been away. I had half-imagined meeting an unanswerable challenge, "We fought the blitz and you were not there." Instead the dock porter asked me confidentially, "What's it like on the other side, mate?" I, who had so often been told that British people were stiff, found them always friendly. Indeed I have been constantly late for engagements because of intimate conversations with passers-by to whom I have never been

introduced! But it was not until I heard the robust speech of those who live north of the Tweed that I felt really at home. I nearly embraced a bus-conductress because of the way she told me how not to get lost in Arbroath!

The Marks of War

Everyone who travels in trains, and trams, and buses is going home from work, night work or day work, and when they are not talking to you they are falling asleep in the corner. That is the sure indication of the plain man's contribution to the great struggle, but he never allows it to get him down. Behind people's eyes is still a latent gaiety, and someone is always making the carriage laugh. War is in some ways less in evidence than in America; nobody comments upon it much; papers cannot afford to waste space in headlines. The armed forces have been tucked away in obscurity; the dispositions have all been made; the fighting strength of a nation has been camouflaged by its resolution. There is a job to be done, and it is being done.

Cities, as I found in 1940 in Madrid, have a way of hiding many of their wounds, so that you forget about destruction until suddenly you see a roofless skyline, or a great rent in the side of a street. Churches are the most desolate casualties because no one has known what to do with their shells. Men and women hide their wounds too, but they cannot stand so much as cities. Behind the brave front of many a city dweller there lies some result of suffering, which no hand of man can ever remedy. You cannot go sight-seeing in the minds and hearts of men, but the real damage lies there.

The Realities of War

This is the record of a civilian, and there are two worlds in Britain, as in so many countries today, which live their lives close to one another and yet apart. I have found it difficult to meet anyone in uniform, save in the most casual way, because there is no reason why I should be taken from the one world to the other. As I travelled one night in a dimly-lit train men in air-force blue slipped out at wayside stations into the night to risk their own lives and deal death to others, while I went home to supper and a hot water bottle in my bed. This is the peculiar horror of a war which on the one hand requires such professional skill, and on the other hand will not confine itself to the battlefields. The civilian world and the military world are cheek by jowl, yet separate; normality prevails amidst all the evidences of destruction. Is it perhaps because of the elusive nature of the war itself that spiritual reality is so hard to come by in Britain as in America? There are neither great poets, nor great

preachers. I found it hard to catch the direction of experience, to know what was really happening to my own people in their anxiety and tedium, their resolution and their indifference.

British Students

In such a situation it is not easy to be a student. The uncertainty of the times is reflected in their minds, and no one knows what he or she will be doing a few months hence. Courses have been shortened and compressed, additional burdens of military training and fire watching eat up spare time. On the men's side the student body is either very young or rather senior. But the British student is standing up to his responsibilities. He is not only getting on with his job as a student but maintaining a surprising amount of that enquiry and discussion which political and religious societies provide. I was told that S.C.M. meetings would be small, but they were always larger than I expected, and often than I remembered in pre-war days. The criticisms of what was happening in the world, and desire for religious certainty reminded me of students in North America. The talk of "Christian Reconstruction" was also similar but not so confident. It was related less to the making of a new world, and more to the binding up of the broken-hearted. The British student has perhaps a more profound diagnosis of the world's ills, but he is less certain that they can be healed.

The Student Christian Movement

I was impressed anew by two factors in the life of the Movement. The first is its continuing strong Christian tradition. Biblical theology, the Christian task of men going into industry, summer conferences of a missionary character and hopeful new opportunities amongst school boys are the main topics on the Movement's agenda. But the college situation, and perhaps most of all the difficulty of finding unencumbered student leadership, produces a sense of resolute planning rather than of the abandon of attack. That moment will come and the movement will be ready.

The second factor is the almost uncanny understanding of the inner meaning of the Federation shown by S.C.M. staff and student leaders. The colleges have raised more money with reduced numbers and greater hindrances largely because the Federation means more to them. One experienced observer commented to me that the Federation was more real than the national movement. Certainly I was asked questions about many countries, though more about Europe than America. Yet it is a common belief in the Church Universal which unites British students with their contemporaries

rather than an effort of fellowship with others which makes them conscious of the Church. Indeed there is almost a danger that S.C.M. members might overlook the disastrous and tragic elements in war because of a conviction about Christian community which had never been sharply challenged. Experience in the forces is challenging it for many, as their letters indicate, and one can only rejoice that behind them, and waiting for them, is a Movement which has given, and will give them so strong a sense of fellowship with all Christian people.

R. C. M.

THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

Our Youth Movements: A Youth Movement in the Church

(A Document prepared for the French Protestant Youth Council)

I. It is in the Church and from the Church that the leaders of our Youth Movements have received their call. It is from the Church that they hold the message they are passing on. And it is in submission, with the Church, to the Word of God, that they purpose to undertake their task of educating youth.

II. In the exercise of their calling they have found that, side by side with their pastoral ministry, they have a very special function to perform. It is in the consciousness of the dignity of this calling, and at the same time in a desire to bear witness within the Church, before the young people and before the world, that they have asked the Churches to dedicate this function and bestow upon it the practical value of a ministry.

III. Our Movements receive their direction and their mission *from* the Church, and it is *towards* the Church that they on their part must guide their members;

(a) because there is no church but a visible church. The very motion of the grace of God is towards incarnation. Jesus Christ gave His disciples the command to baptise all nations. The whole world is called to resurrection. A Christian without attachment to the Church is an impossibility and a contradiction in terms.

(b) because today, as at the Day of Pentecost, the work of the Spirit is to assemble and create a community. The Community *par excellence* is the parish which unites those whom human facts divide: ages, generations, social classes, etc.

IV. Our groups, which may become real spiritual communities, cannot and must not take the place of Church or parish. They can only be communities which are—not artificial, as has been suggested —but incomplete and transitory. They are not the definite place where the Christian life expands and is practised. For they only bring young people together. The sacraments are not celebrated, the authority of the different ministries is not exercised. The leaders must bear this in mind and must not be content with vague

affirmations on this point; but by means of careful and loving individual "direction" must assure themselves that the young people confided to them do not remain undecided and wandering souls who have no link with a concrete parish.

In every respect they must avoid falling into a vague spirituality, a false individualism; further, they must avoid the attitude which, while looking like ecumenism, is apt to become a destructive ecclesiastical or denominational nihilism.

V. But if our movements are youth movements of the Church, are they not in danger of becoming, in a narrow sense of the word, *Church* Youth Movements?

(a) since in practice a Church youth movement is of necessity a *denominational* youth movement. In this way the immense gain of contact with young people of other churches, and therefore our ecumenical position, disappear. The difficulty of contact with Lutheran young people's groups in the occupied zone is an example of this.

(b) also, in practice, a Church youth movement is a *parish* youth movement, almost wholly dependent on the minister of the parish. This situation is a great temptation to the individualism of the minister. His authority tends to be exercised in domains which do not belong to him, and for which he may often lack technical training. The reality that a parish is composed of minister plus his people sometimes becomes blurred.

(c) further, the educative power of youth movements has always lain in the application of the principle of responsibility. Work among young people, carried out by young people, has been a great discovery of pedagogy.

In the framework of a Church Youth Movement, the importance of this principle is diminished.

VI. Finally, we have by no means proved that the Church stands to gain from a *special* youth movement that is too uniform, too dependent. If the movements remain more loosely related, there is a particular value in the personal commitment of the young man or woman who some day discovers through his or her own group what the Church really is. There must always be a much more rigid social restraint upon young people's movements inside the Church than on movements organised as they are today.

VII. We speak of "fitting young people into a framework". This is not a happy expression, because it lends itself to misunderstanding and to an analogy with political vocabulary. The young people of our parishes are not in fact a prey to be caught. They are not an amorphous mass to be divided and put in compartments. We cannot fit them in from outside. What is required is the kindling of new

life among them, the raising up in their midst of witnesses and groups of witnesses. These new terms may make us forget this.

To sum up, we say with confidence:

Experience shows us that the relative independence of youth movements—such as has historically been necessary—may be an advantage. It emphasises the fact that Christian young people must not, any more than the Church as a whole, be subject to a human leader, whether he be minister or not, but only to Jesus Christ. They must wear no uniform, even that of a church; but only the external marks of their Lord. They must not be "fitted in", or protected, but *risked,* so as to become

for the sake of the Church,
within the Church,
with the Church,
outside the Church—

a leaven in the life of the world.

C. JULLIEN.

Students in Southwest China

The Sixth Year

The youngest students who are entering the National Southwest Associated Universities this year can only have been about thirteen years old when the Sino-Japanese war began. During that time many of them have been pushed around the country, studying in various middle schools, which have suffered materially and in the lowering of standards which the war has brought, until they arrived in Kunming where the dormitories are so full that they have to sleep on the floor. Carpenters are busy making double-decker beds, but there are still very few places to study, unless you can afford to go to a tea house. So a number of them find their way to an unobtrusive little building with a Cross over its Chinese gateway, and in the courtyard behind there are rooms for study and reading where they may look at the newspapers and puzzle over an old copy of *The Student Movement* or the *Federation News Sheet.* But alas it is really no longer news, for we have been almost entirely cut off from Christian magazines from the West since Pearl Harbor.

The urge to study goes on, which has been the admiration and envy of other belligerents, though one suspects that for many who are not really student minded this becomes an escape; but Chinese

students are not now so remote from the war as they were in its earliest years. The idea that wars can be fought by coolies is no longer axiomatic, and there is serious talk of conscription next year. A form of conscription has already been tried in the calling of modern language students to enlist as interpreters for the American forces and also for the Chinese Expeditionary Force in Burma and India. Special Preparation Schools with an eight weeks' syllabus were set up, and those of us who were brought up to talk English were roped in to give lectures or take classes. There were a number of Christians in these schools, and I had a Bible study class with two of them. The mutual reaction of the Americans and the Chinese interpreters is interesting. On the whole they get on extremely well, though as one of the interpreters explained to me (he is a Christian) they had to get used to the idea that Americans were not *all* university men, and did not all behave like missionaries or university professors! It is in fact a good thing all round that the Chinese can see a more average type of westerner, while the westerners can see China from a fresh point of view, which is neither the rose-tinted picture of the over-enthusiastic missionary, nor the often jaundiced outlook of the "Old China hand".

The war has also brought India much closer to us in Kunming, and to the students. A number of them have flown to Calcutta and Delhi on various missions of translating and interpreting, and I have armed several friends with addresses of Christians there, in hopes that they may come to know the Federation spirit and the Church supranational from their own experience. The political problems of India have been very keenly discussed here too. On the whole opinion is very sympathetic to the nationalists,—but it is interesting to see that the Indian mind is regarded as no less a mystery to the Chinese, than both Indian and Chinese minds are to the average westerner. Another factor which has brought us into close touch with our neighbours has been the disaster in Burma this spring. Thousands of Chinese refugees came in, many of them after walking for twenty or thirty days in the Yunnan hills, and most of them had never been to China before. A number of Chinese students from Rangoon University have enrolled as students here; but they must join a sub-freshman class because their Chinese is not up to standard. In fact many of them cannot read or write Chinese at all, as they have been brought up to understand English and Burmese.

What are the students thinking about Christianity and other things? Well, for many the words of a famous Canadian S.C.M. song apply: "the student hasn't got a mind!" But not for all. There has been a good deal of sincere questioning and dissatisfaction about the Church in China, a demand for a better type of leader, and a criticism based on the text "By their fruits ye shall know them",

which as Christians we must meet. The logical answer is of course that the more devoted critics who have a vision of higher standards should enter into the service of the Church themselves. Please God they will, but there are difficulties to be overcome, particularly in the present time of inflation, when salaried people, particularly the Church's ministry, have suffered severely, and it has been very hard for the Church to keep up with the ever rising cost of living. Meanwhile a group of Christian students called the "Holy Light Fellowship" have been loyally helping our Church,—and other Churches,—a salutary movement which will help to bring three Churches here, all with student connections, closer together. Their activities have been characteristically Chinese and practical, such as the running of summer vacation schools, organising English speaking classes (there was even a Russian class started last week by a friendly Russian Christian working with the Chinese Army). There are also classes for Bible study, and from time to time a Christian professor, or one who is not unsympathetic, is invited to speak.

Chinese students are great listeners. They listen to classical gramophone records at our Church by the hour every Saturday; and lectures by the better known professors are usually well attended. Most popular lecturer now is Quentin P'ang, professor in eugenics. As he stands with his crutches, (he has only one leg), beaming on his audience through thick glasses, he represents all that is best in the benign, liberal, and at the same time really religious tradition of China. He may be called an unorthodox Christian, and it is interesting to find how many of the Chinese faculty on the universities here,—and they are the most famous universities in China,—have been touched by the life and teaching of Christ. Another well-known professor, Dr. Wu Mi, gave a lecture on "Christian and Platonic Love", and we found that he based it on Nygren's book *Eros and Agape*. But many professors, of course, are not kept up to date on Christian literature, and I think that is one of our more important tasks here. Consequently, a short while ago a small group of students and younger lecturers met to discuss an outline of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Penguin, *Christianity and the Social Order*. Dr. Temple, I believe, would have been interested in the discussion, and we wonder how he would have answered the general criticism that the book was too English and that a book with such a title has no right to skate over the international question.

The universities are very friendly to the Christian movement officially; I have been invited to give a course on English history, which I am doing, and the authorities seem to appreciate the work of our Student Church,—from afar! However we thought that was not quite near enough, so at the end of last term we announced a Baccalaureate Service for the graduating students. In these war

days there is no graduating ceremony of any kind, so we felt that it filled a gap. Forty of the graduating class came, and received tiny copies of the New Testament (the only size we could afford!), while the President of the National Southwest Associated Universities (the combination of Tsing Hua, Peiping National, and Nankai Universities), Dr. Mei I Chi, came and gave the address. Dr. Mei is a Christian, and he spoke on "The Relation of Christianity to the Modern Chinese University". I do not think such a service could have been held in connection with a Government University a few years ago.

But these are only external contacts, and the future whether from the Christian viewpoint or not is by no means clear and bright. There is an increasing tendency to government regimentation. Some professors have found themselves on black lists for speaking too freely, and one famous economist is in a concentration camp. The post-war outlook is not very cheerful, as many Chinese feel it is an alternative between repression and extreme nationalism at home, or continued submission to the victorious western powers abroad. Perhaps this view is too suspicious of the Allies and not sufficiently self-confident about China's own part in the post-war world. But at least it should be expressed, by way of contrast to the excessive praise in the west which has naturally been evoked by China's magnificent war effort in the last five and a half years. For as Christians we should certainly be blind if we thought those years had had no spiritually devastating effect. They have, and we may be prepared for a China in delicate health for some years to come. But that in itself should re-arm Chinese and foreign Christians to the task of reconstruction, for it is to the weak rather than to the strong that the Christian Gospel is prescribed.

GILBERT BAKER.

BOOK REVIEWS

DOSTOIEVSKY AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL. By Paul Evdokimoff. Edition *Ondes*, Editions du Livre français, Lyon.

There stand out three men who, more than others, had a prophetic vision of the catastrophes towards which our age was drifting: Dostoievsky, Kirkegaard and Léon Bloy.

In the little study at Mentone where, for years now, P. Evdokimoff has been ripening the theme of this present work, there might be seen in the place of honour on the wall, the emaciated features of the Slav novelist and the leonine mask of the Catholic pamphleteer. P. Evdokimoff has lived under the sign of these three writers who seem, at first blush, to stand apart. He has laid bare their hidden relationship—they belong to "the violent" of the Scriptures, violent men consumed strangely by the fire of God's judgment, and even more by the fire of His compassion. Let us hope that one day someone may disentangle the message shared by these three men who tried to put the Christian public on their guard, and lead them back to the authentic sources of life before it was too late, and whose cry of alarm echoed back too often from a wall of silence.

P. Evdokimoff's book helps us not only to penetrate more deeply into the Russian soul and the living reality of the Orthodox faith; it sets before us the fundamental questions which every Christian faces and every man ought to face.

. . . . . .

This book is too solid for easy reading; it needs to be read and reread. A certain abuse of philosophical language weighs it down not a little. It presupposes a thorough knowledge of Dostoievsky's work, at all events of his essential work—*The Brothers Karamazoff, The Possessed, Crime and Punishment,* and *The Idiot,* whose characters are constantly quoted. The author himself calls our attention to the difficulty of the problem which he is trying to solve: "This study does not present the teaching of Dostoievsky, because he never expressed his views in an abstract form. It is an effort to conceive in a connected whole the ideas which are scattered through his work, in order to discover the metaphysical essence of the powers of evil in their relation to human destiny."

Dostoievsky died without writing the work in which he meant to present a synthesis of all his thinking. This novel was to be called

The Life of a Great Sinner. The term "life" here is the Slavonic term used in the language of hagiography for the "lives" of the saints. "Sin is life lived outside God: in bringing together these two ideas Dostoievsky wished to emphasise the paradoxical nature of human destiny." But the elements of the "great sinner" are to be found scattered through the entire work of Dostoievsky. In *The Brothers Karamazoff,* it is incarnated at the same time in the three brothers; in the debauchery and passions of Mitia, in the sustained struggle of the rationalist Ivan against God, and in Aliocha's monastic figure and impulse to sanctity. Dostoievsky is not to be identified with any one of the three brothers; he is at one and the same time all the Karamazoffs: "some of them, having lived and been rejected, fall back into nothingness, like Fedor Karamazoff and Smediakoff; the rest continue in Dostoievsky even their 'ideal' existence." . . . "I am a child of this century, even until now and until the grave," he says of himself at the time of his exile in Siberia. And he makes one of his heroes say "God has tortured me all my life long." "My hosanna has come through the crucible of doubt."

Metaphysical anguish haunts him so profoundly that he can conceive of no logical end to atheism save in suicide. "I do not understand," says Kiriloff, "how until now an atheist can know that God does not exist and not kill himself at once." . . . "Man has only invented God in order to live without committing suicide." For Kiriloff, the man who would be his own God, suicide is the supreme affirmation of his revolt, of his "new and terrible freedom".

. . . . . .

For Dostoievsky the problem of evil is indisseverably bound to that of freedom. God wills to be freely loved, for all true love presupposes freedom. "You wished to be freely loved," says the Inquisitor to Christ; and according to him it is precisely this freedom which causes the misery of humanity. In the person of Christ the temptation which for the inhabitant of Paradise ends in the fall, is consummated in unquestioned victory. "Evil is cast out of Christ, His human nature has no inner relationship with evil, and every demonic element is a stranger to him." Man after his fall cannot return to Paradise; that is the meaning of the "Dream of a foolish man" who, transported to Paradise, is homesick for earth. Evil has become the real atmosphere of human life and fallen man cannot avoid experiencing it. There is no redemption for him except through the sufferings and struggles of earth. Man finds himself "involved in the struggle between two worlds, and no one is saved from this destiny, for the struggle has its repercussions even in the human soul where is set the duel between God and the Devil." It

is man's nature to "fall and rise again", to be "angel and demon even while he remains man".

The metaphysical unity of the human race requires that every man has his share in evil, and the guilt of one is the guilt of all. "All are guilty, towards all." This thought recurs constantly in the work of Dostoievsky: we might add that it is a typical Russian conception. The individual responsibility is in some sort dissolved in the omni-guilt of all. "Bolshevism," writes Berdyaieff, "has taken shape in Russia, and has won the day, because I am what I am, because there were not in me real spiritual powers, that power of faith which can remove mountains. Bolshevism is my fault, my sin. It is a trial which is laid upon me. The sufferings which Bolshevism has caused me are the expiation of my fault, my sin, our common fault and sin. All are responsible for all." This is the only manner of life and of regarding a revolution which can be considered as inspired by religion, the only one to shed a spiritual light. "The Russian revolution is the Russian people's destiny, and my destiny, the ransom and expiation owed by that people and by me." In the suffering of this willing expiation a new man is brought to birth. So Mitia Karamazoff can exclaim as he goes away to the convict prison, "We, men of the underground regions, we shall sing in the bowels of the earth a tragic hymn of joy to God! God and His final joy! I love Him!"

Ivan Karamazoff is the incarnation of rationalistic atheism: "love and freedom are unknown to Ivan, and hence come his dilemmas." Mitia, while conscious of his degradation, can still "kiss the hem of the robe that enwraps his God." Dostoievsky knows that sinners and women of evil life will in some cases have a higher place in the kingdom than "the righteous". "He will say to us: 'Beasts that you are, your image is that of the Beast and you bear his mark: yet draw near'. . . . Then the wise and the prudent shall cry out: 'Lord, how then! do you welcome these also?' And He will answer: 'O ye wise and prudent, if I welcome them, it is because not one of them has ever thought himself worthy of the world beyond.' Then He will open His arms to us, and we shall throw ourselves upon His neck and weep . . . and we shall understand everything."

. . . . . .

The Legend of the Grand Inquisitor[1] and the reflections of the Possessed on "chigalevism" are among the most prophetic pages Dostoievsky has written. The theme of the *Legend* is familiar: Dostoievsky imagines a meeting between Christ and a fictitious

[1]The Brothers Karamazoff

personage whom he calls the Grand Inquisitor. "The Grand Inquisitor represents under a conventional form the Roman Church, but he is, for Dostoievsky, the vicar of the Great Spirit (Satan), the incarnation of the 'great idea of Rome', not that of Peter but of the Temptation. This idea has penetrated into all the churches and infected their human character with egocentricity, with self-absorption, self-sufficiency, and resistance to the spirit of true liberty."

"Dostoievsky, under the image of Catholicism, denounces the authentic, *catholic* principle, the universal principle of the Temptation, which is inherent in the religious conscience under all its forms, no less than in the atheist conscience." This is the lust for power, and for a power whose tendency is invincibly to become autonomous. The Great Spirit, by the voice of the Grand Inquisitor, denounces the Utopian nature of the Incarnation, of the expiation which is based upon the Incarnation. Christ has made a mistake in laying upon man the terrible burden of a free choice. In rejecting the Satanic plan, in refusing to the multitudes bread, miracles, and the signs of power they expected, He demands too much of human strength: "What is to happen to the thousands and tens of thousands who have not the courage to prefer heavenly to earthly bread?" The Inquisitor undertakes to "amend" the work of Christ and to deliver man from the burden of freedom.

The three temptations represent "in three stages the whole future history of humanity". In the forefront of the first stage is the principle of material well-being, the exclusiveness of the economic problem. It is to him who has bread that men will come "like a docile, grateful flock". The second temptation sheds light upon the principle of the miraculous, of technical control of the elements, of vast and grandiose possibilities in the rule of man; the third, finally, sets in full view the principle of the sword of Cæsar in his glory, of the power of force, of a constraint which unifies. "We shall organise their life like a children's game. . . . We shall even allow them to sin . . . they will cherish us like benefactors who bear their sins before God. They will have no secrets from us . . . they will submit to us the most painful secrets of their consciences, we shall determine every case and they will accept our decision with gladness, for it will spare them the great anxiety of making their own free choice. . . . They will die in peace, they will destroy themselves in Thy name, and in the Beyond they will find nothing but death."

This dream of domination which the Grand Inquisitor develops on a mystical plane, is transferred by the revolutionaries of *The Possessed* to a secular and political plane. Dostoievsky begins by calling Russian liberalism to account: "they never loved the people,

nor suffered in their pains, they never made any sacrifice." Russian liberalism is a colossal parasite, which, torn out of its own soil, sows strange and sterile precepts. . . . The essence of liberalism for Dostoievsky in the ideas of progress, of humanism, of socialism, is fundamentally the spirit of atheism which inspires the entire modern civilisation to become "a virtue without Christ". The liberalism of the fathers ends in the nihilism of the children. "Your one desire is to destroy everything, the State and its ethic. We shall remain alone, we who are determined and prepared to take power in our hands. We shall rally to us all who are intelligent; as for the fools, we shall make them beasts of burden . . . the education of the present generation must be built up again . . .[1] The man of the revolution is a chaos"; we meet here the revolutionary formula par excellence —"everything is permitted". The guiding principles of this disorder are "omnitude", conformity elevated to be the supreme rule of life. "The principal power, the cement which binds everything together, is the fear of public opinion. Ah! think of the power of it! Difficult though it be to lay one's hand upon it, soon there will be nobody to be found with the slightest idea of his own. That would be a disgrace. . . . Can you imagine by what a number of little ready-made ideas we guide our conduct? Do you know how terribly strong we are? . . . The schoolmaster who joins with his pupils to mock their God and their childhood's cradle, belongs to us. The advocate who pleads the case of the intelligent murderer just because he is superior in culture to his victim, and because the need of money compelled him to kill—he belongs to us. The schoolboys who murder a peasant in search of sensation are also of our number. The juries who acquit a proved criminal belong to us too. The attorney who trembles in his court at the thought that possibly he is not sufficiently liberal—he also belongs to us. As for the administrators, the men of letters, many, very many, of them, are of our number, and are yet unconscious of the fact."

"There is nothing more powerful than uniformity. I deliberately invent titles and functions; I appoint secretaries, secret councillors, cashiers, presidents, administrators, with their assessors, and it all answers admirably and gives the greatest satisfaction."

The moral sentiment is relegated to the rank of a "bourgeois prejudice". "The moral is our plan, our cause." Numbers, the multitudes, the masses triumph. If the theorists of the revolution were idealists—a Chatoff, or a Kiriloff,—the realists would be pure cynics. The new world they are elaborating moves towards the void. Nihilism results fatally in unlimited despotism. The earthly paradise of a Chigalev offers no other alternative than "happiness or death".

[1] The Possessed.

"Each member spies on his neighbour and is kept back from denouncing him. Each belongs to all and all are the property of each." The rule of Satan ends in a perfect caricature of the Kingdom of God. It has its own demonic eschatology.

. . . . . .

The God of Dostoievsky is the God of the Incarnation and the Cross—a God who suffers. "The world is polarised just as the nerves of Dostoievsky are polarised—good and evil, Christ and the Grand Inquisitor, the Madonna and Sodom,—and in the web of the human heart the threads of the two poles cross and each one tends to its own choice."

The figures of the *staretz* Zoxime, and of Bishop Tikhon show what the work of grace can accomplish. The saint is not an invention. "I shall create nothing, I shall merely reveal a real Tikhon," writes Dostoievsky. "The true saint is not the creation of a novelist, but of God," Evdokimoff remarks in this connection. Dostoievsky conducts Aliocha, Raskolnikoff to the threshold of their new life, a life of faith, of willing expiation in the joy of the Lord. But here "begins another story, the story of man . . . of his crossing from one world into another world, of his ascension to a new reality which until that moment had been unknown to him. This may well be the subject of another book; but of our present work we have reached the end."

Dostoievsky said himself that always and in every matter he went to the very end and that all his life he was crossing the borders of the possible. His heroes push all their theories to their extremity; —there is no middle course between transfiguration and suicide, and face to face with the God-man rises up the "man-god" in his unfettered nihilism.

If God has granted a specific grace to the Russian soul, is it not just this, the power of being possessed by a metaphysical torment which will not let go of its victim but finds its outlet in the very violence of its negations? That is why saints and "the possessed" exceed common limits.

Events have proved to us that the characters of Dostoievsky do not exist in fiction alone. In revealing to us the essence of the demonic power which animates them, Dostoievsky does more than unveil for us the depth of the Russian soul: it is the entire tragedy of contemporary civilisation which passes before our eyes. The great alternative challenges us: "Chigalevism or freedom under the sign of Christ."

SUZANNE DE DIETRICH.

THE JEW IN THE CHRISTIAN WORLD. By Hans Kosmala and Robert Smith. Published by *Student Christian Movement Press, London, England.*

There have been many reviews of this book. Some have been most critical because of the emphasis on Jewish Evangelism in the book. The title *The Jew in the Christian World* reminds one of the title of another book recently published, namely *The Jews in a Gentile World*, by Isacque Graeber.

Both books deal with the religious issue. *The Jews in a Gentile World* though deliberately trying to avoid the religious factor is forced to include it, for one cannot discuss Jewish-Gentile, much less Jewish-Christian relationships without consideration of the religious factor.

Canon Danby maintains that whereas the Church owes its existence to the acceptance of Jesus, the Synagogue owes its existence to its continued rejection of Jesus. It is significant that the Jews have never denied this rejection of Jesus on their part and it is here that the wall of partition between Jew and Christian has been built up. However much we may attribute anti-Semitism to political, social, economic, racial or other factors, underlying and basic remains this wall between acceptance of Jesus by the Church and the rejection of Jesus by the Synagogue. It is this wall that fundamentally inhibits any real improvement in the relationships between the two.

There is frank recognition that anti-Semitism is inconsistent with the teaching of Jesus. This is as it should be, for Hitler has clearly revealed that anti-Semitism if consistent must also be anti-Christian because all essentials of the Christian faith have their roots in Judaism and are of Jewish origin.

In Chapter 4, the book deals essentially with Jewish views of Jesus. Whereas one welcomes the increasing consideration Jewish scholarship is giving to the person of Jesus, we must recognise that it is Jesus and not Christ Who is being extolled. Acceptance of Jesus as a prophet is not enough, for Jesus is more than a prophet, He is Christ the Messiah. It is at this point that the Church must maintain a clear and firm perspective in its effort to approach the Jews and to better relationships between Christians and Jews. The denial of Jesus as Christ by the Jews and even by some non-Jews goes so far as to demand not only modification but even elimination of the New Testament story of the crucifixion.

In this chapter also we have a most stimulating if not provocative thesis advanced in what the author calls Noachism. Presumably this is a deliberate if not an insidious attempt to belittle Christian theology about Jesus and to spread a new reverence and regard for

the Law of Judaism. Not all will agree with the authors in their emphasis on this matter.

When it comes to the Goodwill Movement between Jew and Christian, recognition is given to the value of such a movement in promoting good-will, understanding and co-operation. It is pointed out, however, that the conditions advanced for such co-operation tend to put Christianity and Judaism on a par to the exclusion of Christ's real significance as Son of God and revealer of God as well as Redeemer of man. In this connection we are told that the missionary zeal of Judaism is being rekindled and that there are many who advocate and firmly believe that Judaism is to become the universal religion of future mankind. With this obviously the authors do not agree.

Then follows a chapter on Anti-Semitism, which is an up to date and good review of the subject though little new to the subject is added. Obviously Zionism is dealt with as a possible alternative for solving the problem of relationships or at least for ameliorating them. This chapter touches on the post-war future of the Jews and raises pertinent questions as to what is to become of the unwanted Jews in Central and Eastern Europe, that is, of those Jews who survive the extermination now going on under brutish Nazi domination. No post-war future of the Jews is possible without consultation with America, for America by virtue of its large number of Jews, their comparative freedom and their great influence in the world must play a vital part in whatever solution or salvation of the Jews is contemplated. No one will accept Zionism as the cure-all and one may well ask whether it is the only ideal left to the Jews for their continued cultural mission in the world. As another alternative the authors stress the Christian approach to the Jews and declare that anti-Semitism begins when we refuse to share the Gospel of Jesus Christ with our Jewish neighbours.

The book is one for these times when the Church perhaps as never before is compelled to face the question of her responsibility to the Jewish people of the world.

CONRAD HOFFMANN, JR.

THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine of the World's Student Christian Federation

ROBERT C. MACKIE, EDITOR

Temporary addresses of the Editor, 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., U.S.A., and 151 Bloor Street W., Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada.

Volume XXXVI Third Quarter, 1943 Number 3

EDITORIAL

Today's Suffering and To-morrow's Tasks

We are troubled on every side, yet not in distress;" wrote Paul the apostle, "we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted but not forsaken; cast down but not destroyed."

In war it is youth which bears the brunt of suffering. To youth is given the responsibility of destroying the lives of others, and of running in the face of death. Starvation of body and mind, frustration of natural ambitions, and the burden of prolonged separation fall with disproportionate hardship upon the younger generation. As Suzanne de Dietrich writes: "It is the youth of the whole world, which war today is decimating, and revolution is wearing down." Then she adds, to remind us of our responsibilities: "And this youth is the Church of to-morrow." This issue of THE STUDENT WORLD, *assembled in the haphazard fashion that war-time conditions seem to make inevitable, may serve to relate in our thinking the present sharp experiences of youth with the tasks of the World's Student Christian Federation, and other Christian youth movements, in the future.*

The article on France is the most moving statement of the thoughts of a young European Christian that we have had the privilege of publishing. It should be read, not only for its insight

into a particular national situation, but for its indication of what must be passing through many sensitive minds, which are not in a position to express themselves today. "You must realise this," he writes, "if there is nothing with deeper roots than hope in the hearts of the oppressed, the days pass very slowly with their gleanings of bad news, restrictions, firing-squads, convoys off to Germany. . . . Afterwards—afterwards one must live, and no one knows how that will really be possible after all these sufferings, all this destruction, all the disillusion that has accumulated through twenty-five years, all these mysterious years of imprisonment—and who knows if our men will return from that?" Here is an attitude very close to despair. Suzanne de Dietrich uses the very word: "Once all the human ideologies are proved to be no more than balloons that have burst," she writes "once our young people face emptiness with despair in their hearts, will our movements be able to approach them?"

Turning from Europe to Asia we find suffering in another form, that sense of frustration which characterises the thinking of Indian students. The two articles on India and Britain are not designed to put the readers of The Student World *in a position to make a judgment on one of the front-rank political issues of our day. For that purpose they must go to the manifold literature on the subject. But the words of one of the most honoured missionaries, who ever gave a lifetime's service to India, and of an able Indian graduate, whose co-operation the editor has greatly appreciated, bring us into contact with the agony of spirit with which enlightened British and Indian Christians view the present political impasse in the relations between their two countries. Mr. Singh calls it the Indian* tragedy, *and Dr. Macnicol writes: "So it comes about that today, forgetting past relationships of comradeship and loyal service, Britain and India have fallen apart and their disagreement clouds the future of them both." For anyone, who has eyes to see, the heart-felt sympathy expressed in the first article, and the courteous restraint maintained in the second, simply serve to show what this disagreement is costing the Christian Church.*

There have been many articles in the past which have shown us the effect of war upon the Chinese universities, but the conversational method of News Out of China *brings the story of deprivation and sacrifice and loyalty sharply before us. But there is apparent also an undertone of less tangible suffering,*

which we should do well to notice, for it may prove harder to bear. "There is a marked tendency to control thought in a given direction. To resist the trend—and to read and discuss and to learn so that we may form true and just judgments—is in some places becoming a dangerous occupation for which a high cost may have to be paid." Students will carry on their life of study under every conceivable disadvantage; dispersion and imprisonment have not baffled them. But the absence of freedom of expression chills the stoutest heart. It is only to be expected that the Student Christian Movement in China should be sensitive to this new development. The article on Japan shows a magnificent determination to maintain a Christian witness in altered circumstances. Perhaps the most revealing statement by one who had such unusual opportunities of observation is this: "New courage seemed to characterise the attitude of many of the Christian students."

"Perplexed, but not in despair"—the words still ring true. The Indian S.C.M. leader ends his article: "In the midst of such misgivings there seems to be only one beacon of light, the Church, unless her light is stamped out by local and national loyalties." The French writer appeals to the same source of faith and hope. In Geneva, in a country surrounded by warfare, the Swiss S.C.M. and the W.S.C.F. in co-operation held in the beginning of April an Ecumenical Study Week, at which the address on "The Youth Movements in the Church Militant" was delivered. Once again Europe has given a lead to the countries more remote from war. Will our movements be able to approach these young men and women who have suffered? That is a question we must face, and with wisdom and penetration we are helped to do so. St. Paul was not in despair because he knew "that he which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise us up also by Jesus". Is it too much to expect that in every country we shall see being formed these "replacement units" of which Suzanne de Dietrich speaks? That is our primary task of "reconstruction". We may have to form and reform them again and again, but we must not fail this youth which suffers so deeply, and is "the Church of to-morrow".

R. C. M.

Thoughts on France

Michel Furfande

France has known misery. Perhaps that is all there is to be said, for misery has no story to tell. Our imaginations are sluggish enough, but they are able to picture events which are brilliant or dramatic. Only the meannesses of every day, trifling deceptions that are so necessary and yet so sordid, the humiliations we must accept in order to go on living—such things can scarcely be imagined. Think of a prosperous family which awakes some morning to find itself plunged into want, so that, whether it likes it or no, it must resign itself to the thousand and one drearinesses that poverty brings, to work that degrades, to dirty lodgings, to accounts that never balance at the end of the week; so that it goes in dread of tradesmen whose bills are unpaid, and of the scorn of rich relatives—such is the present experience of our country.

Everyone faces misery in his own way. We used to hear of Russian aristocrats in exile who drove taxis during the week in order to wear their court-uniforms again on Sunday. That may have been so; but we at all events could never boast of such elegance. It was our destiny to bear our misfortunes dully, heavily, in an ungraceful fashion. But at least we did not pose. In that we did not betray ourselves, but remained true to our past. We did not know how to come to terms with misfortune, nor how to tell lies like men who refuse to admit defeat. Of one vice at least no one can accuse us—of hypocrisy. We do not know how to lie. And if the official speeches were full of lies, they were too absurd, too pathetic, too outrageous for anyone to believe them. Perhaps we were flooded with lies, but what did that mean save more shame, more suffering for us to bear. *We* were unable to perpetrate the falsehoods which save appearances. It might have been better for us if we had been able, for in saving appearances men sometimes also save the will to conform to them, whereas France lost at one and the same time both appearances and her very sense of honour.

I know that it is part of our genius to be able to roll to the very bottom of the slope instead of pulling ourselves up, like some others, by miracles of resolution. If there are any miracles in France, they are miracles not of pride but of faith. I know that when misfortune comes upon us we have to drink it to the dregs, stupidly—yes, stupidly, so that we even choke, so that we collapse, and long for someone to give us a finishing stroke. I am certain that when this self-despair overwhelms us, even the angels of God may wonder how we are ever going to rise above circumstances. Nobody can measure the depths of our self-abandonment in this adventure. Nobody can tell at what point we lost our footing. That would be something to make our enemies rejoice, and all pharisees shudder. But you must know this, that it is our destiny to sink like a piece of wreckage before we are able to rise again; and that even in this we only remain what we were before: descendants of Frenchmen of every age, both of that ridiculous knighthood which allowed itself to be cut to pieces at Agincourt, and of those who knew the disgrace of the treaty of Troyes or the rout after Waterloo. . . .

Alone with our destiny

But you must also be clear on this point: though pharisees are shocked, and though honest men turn aside for shame, that makes no difference to our future destiny. We have not done with astonishing ourselves. "This is the end," people say; "this time they will not recover. They have passed the limit at last; they are really done for now." How often in our history might one have passed that judgment on us? Every people has its own method of sinning. Who could even measure us, or measure the grace of God? Surely that defies all the laws of good sense, of statistics and of morality. Even when to human eyes all is lost, no one has the right to say that all is really lost. This is true because we are talking of France, and France does not stand alone.

I should not write these words if I were still in France with our friends and trying to save what still may be saved. You must not think that we supposed with the enemies of the apostle Paul that one can do ill in order that good may come. But I must in all fairness speak to you as one who deserted from the fight, and who, now he is behind the lines, can only meditate and pray about those who continue to struggle. From the place

where I am I can say no less than the truth: at the point where we could no longer be loyal to our past glory, we were at least loyal to our misery. And so conscious are we of the depths to which we have sunk, that even while we do our utmost we have no hope for the future except in God.

You must understand that a feeling exists which might poison the peace. If the Anglo-Saxon powers look on France with the pity one feels for someone who has "gone wrong", to whom one says "we told you so"; if the Anglo-Saxon powers regard us as a youth who has turned out badly and who needs to be put back on the straight road, then there will be no peace for our country. The humiliation France knows today would be nothing to that fresh humiliation. Whatever our mistakes, we shall understand them sufficiently by ourselves without hearing them from someone else's lips. Those who have suffered so much have, alas! very little to learn from those who were able to resist unto victory and to make way against contrary winds. And even supposing we had something to learn from those who stoop to us it is doubtful if we could understand it. A great deal of wisdom will be required in handling a stricken Europe.

Further you must understand that "hitlerism" has never touched us. How could France be penetrated by such folly when her very temperament is the surest antidote against it? The French people could never understand, or even imagine, hitlerism. Our whole culture, our whole civilisation had of necessity this clear consequence, that our ears were deaf to the accents which echoed across the Rhine. Think of Montaigne face to face with Luther, Rabelais with Wagner, or Giraudoux with Nietszche! The conclusion to which the French mind came was that all this hubbub was not serious. Hitler indeed? pooh! was it not our own brave General Boulanger over again, and nothing more! Of course now we are convinced that this was one of the reasons for our defeat, that this was why Maréchal Pétain believed in the possibility of collaboration. None of this would have happened if French moderation had been able to understand hitlerian excess. Today we are reaping the fruits of our blindness. Whatever is said, or done, the hitlerian pestilence has got no real grip upon us. The Frenchman may be stunned in the face of the invader, he may be terrified, overwhelmed, furious, or even admiring, but once he has shut his door again he becomes exactly what he was before. They stand idly gaping in the streets, the French people, and the conqueror readily thinks he has overcome

them. Perhaps the Frenchman thinks so himself. But if you watch him pick up his work, turn back to his friends, his wife, his children, you see he has not changed a bit. There's life in the little fellow yet!

Playing the political game

There is then nothing new, nothing specifically nazi in the French political scene since the Armistice. Classes, groups and interests, the men who wield power under German control—all have long been familiar to us. They are trying to profit as best they may from the good fortune the conquerors offer them, and play their own political game while Germany tries to make them play hers. It would not be fair to consider them Germany's men. It might be better to compare them to those "émigrés" who came back to France in 1814 and 1815 in foreign baggage-wagons. They had been driven back by that revolution in embryo which was actually the triumph of the "popular front" and they returned to find their place and their ambition by favour of the conqueror. You cannot get it out of the heads of a goodly number of Frenchmen that, as they failed to catch democracy "head on", they caught it "on the rebound". (I believe that is a communist slogan.) But if their situation is singularly ambiguous in relation to the country, it would be artless in the extreme to suppose that all is limpidly clear as between them and Germany, for they can never be more to her than men of straw. Whatever concessions they may have had to make to the conquerors, they still represent a pre-existing element in French political life.

What are they indeed but the big business of French bourgeoisie? Over these men hovers the mystery of administrative consultations, of economic machinations forged in secret. Freemasonry is but child's play, the very light of day compared with the complex and subtle web they are weaving. There is no question that for them Public Enemy Number One was democracy of an extremist and communistic type. In their struggle against this it is certain that before the war they did more than coquet with Germany. Were they really aware of the nazi demon with all its power and its redoubtable complexity? We cannot tell. Did they merely see in nazism the rule of authority which would restore order to the streets and order in the factories? Such naïveté is after all not wholly impossible. Many soldiers shared this responsibility after the war through their profound ignorance of the fundamental nihilism of nazism.

In its wake this "big business of the bourgeoisie" drags the whole bourgeoisie except for a large section of the intellectuals. The fear of communism is their whole political science. Yet this fear scarcely conceals a more general distrust of the entire people. The trench which at the time of the French revolution separated aristocracy from proletariat has now been dug between people and bourgeoisie. They are ignorant of each other, they distrust and fear one another.

But while we may accuse big business of betraying the country through fear of the people, we must admit that the bourgeoisie itself, though sharing these fears, was not guilty of the same betrayal. Fear may have blinded them, may have so inhibited them as to make them incapable of their role as a responsible élite (an élite is always responsible); still we cannot all the same accuse them of having sold France. But we must make it clear that they were, and remain, unworthy of the task imposed upon them. Their fear of the people whom it is their part to guide, their lack of culture—that is, their unawareness of problems of the day—and finally the debility that results from living too well, these are the defects which explain their surrender. Perhaps they accused the people of recognising their rights while forgetting their duties, yet they have themselves been not less guilty of the same fault, jealous of their privileges and forgetful of their responsibilities.

But it would be too simple to suppose that the fall of France was caused only by betrayal or by the surrender of the élite. If the people of France wish to live they must rise again. It is too easy to blame the élite in order to exonerate the people. It is rare for a people not to have, to a certain extent, the élite and the government it deserves: there is always a harmony, whether latent or obvious, between the people and the ruling classes. And when the people plays as considerable a part in political life as it did in France before the war, it cannot escape the responsibility for the disgrace and misfortunes that come upon it.

The failure of idealism

The entire French people has proved unworthy of the destiny it had chosen for itself. Before explaining in what way it proved unworthy, let us try to say why. And here I should like to put forward two reasons. In the first place France carried the heaviest burden of inheritance imaginable: her own

idealism. Perhaps it is necessary to understand the spiritual atmosphere of the revolutions in France, and particularly of the revolution of 1848, to appreciate this statement. While in other countries idealism is possibly tempered by a realistic turn of mind and by a practical familiarity with men and with affairs, French idealism feeds on, yes even is exalted upon, all *our* common sense and all *our* easy good nature. The realism which results from the handling of affairs may elsewhere moderate and canalise idealism so that its worst extravagances are reduced to what is reasonable and practical; but with us it seems as if common sense and the love of moderation lead to our accepting the most improbable and dangerous conceptions as something simple, evident and natural. German, French, or American idealism, for example, have nothing in common. In France the idealist wanders about in the clouds, with his pipe, his open collar and his smile just as if he were in the heart of the country or on his own plot of ground. He talks of his dreams with the same seriousness, the same irony, the same enthusiasm and critical sense as he would of his trade or his family. And what is more everyone believes the dreams are as real as the trade or the family; whether it be Lamartine, Hugo, Jaurès, Péguy or Guéhenno that is in question, it is the same old story. Alas! there cames a moment when reality calls him back to order. . . .

But further, since we are talking of idealism we must be sure to explain how our idealism had declined in value. French idealism has no other source than Christianity: it is secularised charity. When it cut the bonds which attached it to faith, French idealism lost all that profound realism which is so characteristic of Christian humanism. The dechristianisation of French thought had the immediate consequence of plunging us into a flood of illusion. Dechristianisation meant for us in the first place not materialism but "illusionism". As gradually for complicated reasons—of which the principal one seems to us to be the betrayal of the Church—Frenchmen turned elsewhere than to faith in their search for reasons and rules of life, they simply transcribed Christian thought while at the same time robbing it of its God and its discipline. They wandered off into the clouds. Later on this idealism became vulgarised and tarnished without losing for all that its illusory character.

And this leads us to our second reason. Why has French idealism so depreciated in value? Why did those great ideas

which blew up the Bastille and shook tyrants, why did those watchwords which caused the whole of Europe to thrill with fear, change gradually into the pathetic dreams we knew before the war? Bread, Peace, Liberty—all of these certainly! but behind them what a longing for a quiet life with the minimum of risk and the maximum of comfort! In 1936 we could still catch an echo among our people—but how sadly changed since the days of 1789, of 1830, of 1848, not to mention those tragic days of 1871! Whence this sorry change, this impoverishment of the French ideal?

Exhaustion and despair

We must admit that in the first World War of 1914-1918 against Germany and the Central Powers France made by far the greatest contribution. Dare we hope that that will be remembered on the day of peace? It was the error of Britain not to understand in 1919 that France was more exhausted in victory than Germany was in defeat. It was a further error of Britain and of the United States not to recognise at the moment of official declaration of war against Hitler that the French had been in the front line during the first round and required to be relieved. The fate of France in 1940 was that of a division which has been decimated and is sent back to the line without having been made up to strength. You know that melancholy jest of the soldiers in the last war: "It is always the same fellows who get killed." Alas! you have learnt by now that the moment arrives when relief is indispensable.

Between 1919 and 1939 France was never able to recover her health, just like an invalid on whom the strain of illness has been too great, so that though cured in the eyes of science he cannot pick up his strength again. Peace lasted only long enough for us to dream of peace. We had very soon to change our tune. Germany so quickly began to threaten that we had good cause to question our victory. And then our finances were in a bad state, unemployment began, and we could not see that things were likely to improve. It became evident that the war instead of settling things had made a mess of them; and that while victory had restored Alsace and Lorraine to us, it had also plunged us into a chaos from which no way out was to be seen. When the last fireworks of the 14th of July, 1935, had finally burnt out, all that a Frenchman could do was to enjoy whatever peace was

left to him, while he awaited with terror the inevitable moment when fighting would start once more.

Disillusioned by the peace, disillusioned by their allies, disillusioned by the succession of men in power, unable to see any light on the situation, kept by a misguided press in a state of ignorance beside which the falsehoods of Hitler's press seem almost intelligent, the French people passed through an attack of terrible disgust. Twenty years after they had proved to the world that it was possible to die without murmur three hundred and sixty-five times a year, to find themselves deserted like a poor old man whom everyone puts off with idle stories—that was a trial to which I would not willingly subject anyone. Do you wonder now if the French said to themselves that as nobody cared a straw for them, so they would snap their fingers at the world? Food and drink and a little amusement—what more was there to ask for? Besides a man can only die once. And so a generous-hearted people can slip for a while into the narrow egotism of old age.

The war, the defeat and the national revolution have merely served to confirm the French people in the distaste they feel for the whole world as well as for themselves. They reflect that their defeat was not natural, not, as they say, "a blow taken in fair fight". They think they were betrayed and not knowing whom to blame, they blame all the world. They have too much good sense not to reproach themselves in secret; they know very well that they let themselves go, that much might be said about that devil-may-care attitude of theirs, and that in any case they should have done better. But they do not like to have this pointed out to them, particularly by those in power, whom they suspect of being not wholly innocent of their disaster, and who in any case represent a policy of submission to the German oppressors, as well as bourgeois reaction in all its forms. The difference of outlook between the two zones is gradually disappearing. There remains only a great people abandoned to its distress, and knowing neither what to attach itself to nor where to set its hope. To be sure the Russians stand firm, and Communism may have possibly a certain prestige; but no one can tell today what is the true power of Communism in France. Everyone imagines it must have some power, but no one knows exactly what. It is only reasonable to suppose that it will have but a poor chance of success when peace is established, unless all other solutions fall to the ground. It would only be in a case of desperation that the

French people would give in to Communism, and today we do not see that they have in the least made up their minds to such an extremity.

"When will it all be over?"

To what then have they made up their minds? To anything at all? No, less than ever. They are simply waiting, waiting for the next months to pass, and asking "When will it all be over?" For the time passes slowly for men and women under the heel of the oppressor. Every time the Allies start an undertaking they rejoice as if it were the beginning of the end. But you must realise this: if there is nothing with deeper roots than hope in the hearts of the oppressed, the days pass very slowly with their gleanings of bad news, restrictions, firing-squads, convoys off to Germany. Today no Frenchman's imagination reaches beyond the moment when the Germans leave the national soil. Afterwards—afterwards one must live, and no one knows how that will really be possible after all these sufferings, all this destruction, all the disillusion that has accumulated through twenty-five years, all these mysterious years of imprisonment—and who knows if our men will return from that?

Perhaps the French people have never felt themselves so wholly deserted since the evil days of the Hundred Years' War. Nothing, nobody to care for. Nobody in whom to put trust or hope. Nobody to speak to them in human language, explaining what has happened and what has to be done. Robbed of everything, reduced to slavery, uncertain of himself, what is left for the Frenchman but to shut himself into his own chimney corner by a wretched fire, chewing at a pipe which has long ago gone out? He doesn't want to hear any more about the world: the world for him is simply "they", that mysterious "they" which describes those who can still have power to dislodge him from his retreat, who make prices go up, who snatch the bread from his very mouth, who harangue him incessantly in the newspapers and on the radio, who have nothing better to do than make things go from bad to worse. Would that "they" would go to the devil! There is scarcely time as it is for all those unbelievably complicated processes which are the only way to keep clothed and shod and not to die of hunger.

So you have a great people left to itself, without light and without any landmark to tell it where it is. There is no one there any more to show it the way. The radio and the cinema are not

sufficient in themselves to form a man or a nation. Leaders of another sort are necessary, and France has been without these for a long time now. Of the three elements which are normally responsible for the education of a people—the Church, the Family and the School—not one has adequately fulfilled its task. For a long time too the Schools have been unequal to their task, whether because the slogans of lay morality which were taught to French children have no more hold over the minds of "modern" youth, or because all the confusion and changes of curriculum have been harmful to instruction, or perhaps because the outlook of the teachers' training colleges has been so deeply influenced in recent years by the ideology of the extreme left as to be deplored from the point of view of education. Then the family in France, as in all other countries, has had to undergo the powerful impact of the modern world, which tends to reduce man until he is no more than an unattached individual lost in an inorganic mass. The family has been losing its privileged function as a primitive cell in which the child was formed for life; he can no longer find in it the echo of what he learns in church or in school. As for the Church, even when not obsessed by clericalism as by an evil spirit, what influence has it been able to wield over a people who had good reason for their anti-clericalism? And in any case what message had it to offer? Without denying the fine work of the Youth Movements, both Catholic and Protestant, one must in all honesty admit that they only touched a small minority of French youth. How many boys have we seen in these new training camps for youth who up to the age of twenty had never heard a human word addressed to them —in a language which had no vain grandiloquence but said with wise sympathy what everyone needs to be told!

And yet it is only the Church that can get us out of our impasse. When we speak here of the Church we are not thinking in particular of either the Catholic Church or of our own Protestant Church, but of every Church that is true to its Lord and true to its earthly calling. Is there anyone on whom France can rely? On the bourgeoisie? Even if they have not been traitors they need as much guidance as the rest of the people. The intellectuals? Before the war they were only able to inflate our fancies, they are not to be trusted. And the army is really only the bourgeoisie. As for the civil servants, the tax-inspectors, the naval officers, the college-trained technicians, what are they but the bourgeoisie? The Church alone cannot be bourgeois.

Only the Church can save us

Only the Church can save us. But it must want to do so! The Church must once more become loyal and devoted to its one Saviour; and in the realm of action, it must do all it can to remove the hateful misunderstanding which separates it from the French people. The whole range of French life since 1871 at least has been vitiated by the absurd struggle between clericalism and anti-clericalism. For this struggle the Church bears practically the entire responsibility because it allied its destiny with the bourgeois powers of the day. The Church betrayed the people of France in abandoning them to their own destiny, to their parties and dreams. It betrayed the élite of France in that it flattered them and protected them instead of reproving, correcting and guiding them as was its duty to do. It betrayed France in poisoning with its own hatred the conflict which for so long has separated people from bourgeoisie. It betrayed Jesus Christ in drawing Him into a sordid quarrel. For when clericalism gained ground, He gained nothing, and when clericalism lost ground, it was He who was mocked.

It is of great importance that the Church should turn back from all these errors and be willing to serve not its own ends but our God and our country. There is hope that the Catholic Church understands this, for just before the national revolution it had a fine opportunity of making a clerical advance; yet it appears not to have benefited, or at all events not in any systematic way. So we are, thank God, a long way from the comedy of the "moral order" of 1871 and after. The Church must run the risk of being no more than it is: not a human force in the State but the Servant of Jesus Christ for the service of men. Its weapons like its ambitions have nothing to do with politics.

Further, the Church must work out the message which it has to bring to men. It is our belief that in a world where all human values and all human ideas are bankrupt the Word of God alone is not out of date. Therefore the Word of God must be heard by men and women. Therefore the Church must expound it and clarify it by its own actions and the actions of all Christians who stand by their convictions. This problem faces Catholicism no less than Protestantism in France. The teaching of the Church must no longer limit itself to theology in the narrow sense of the word, nor yet to individual conduct. It must

embrace the entire range of problems which our nation will have to solve. It is the wonder of the Christian Revelation that we may say with good reason that all is summed up in Jesus Christ and at the same time that nothing human is alien to Him. But we must grasp this truth and draw from it its practical conclusions.

But if the Church, the churches, succeed in overcoming their inertia, their temptations, their evil spirits—that double struggle —if they can free themselves from clericalism and in the end achieve a message for France which is profoundly human and practical as well as religious, we believe that nothing need be beyond the power of our country. It is the only hope of salvation, but it is a hope without limit or restrictions. On the Church, and on God, depends the future of France. If the Church is faithful in doing no evil but in doing all the good to which it is called, then we may hope that our country, wearied with her march towards mirages of every kind, may yet be given grace by God to rediscover that true wisdom which is faith. We are at that moment of our history when the only solution for us is a miracle, the only possibility is the impossible, the only hope lies in that which transcends hope. We are indeed looking into the face of God. Yet from out of our past there rise other similar moments; other Frenchmen besides ourselves have known periods no less solemn. As we look into the face of God we are surrounded by the crowd of all those Frenchmen who knew misery like ours, and hopes like ours—and the same salvation. France stands today in the presence of God; and truly it is France as we have always known her.

India and the Future

Nicol Macnicol

It is not easy to concern oneself with India's future at a time when her present circumstances cause so much concern. There is also the fact that the decisions of today, which hang in the balance, will in large measure determine her tomorrow. The future issues from the past and, though this relationship is not for the Christian as relentless as the Indian law of Karma would make it, yet we too do well to remember that men and nations, but for the grace of God, will reap as they have sown. Let us then look, however cursorily, at the past and see what it promises or threatens, before we try to forecast the shape of things to come.

The part that Great Britain has played

For our purpose in this brief survey the past signifies mainly the part that Great Britain has played in the moulding of her great dependency. In earlier days it used often to be said by Indians, that this relationship of the two peoples had come about "in the providence of God". This phrase was formerly used in entire sincerity and with real gratitude. More recently one could detect in its use a note of irony. We cannot weigh against each other the evil and the good that our intercourse with her through more than three centuries has brought. The first Englishman to set foot in India is believed to have been the Jesuit Thomas Stevens who in the sixteenth century went there as a messenger of the Christian Gospel. Hard on his heels there arrived the earliest of the long line of merchant adventurers whose purpose was "to shake the pagoda tree", or, perhaps, as St. Francis Xavier said of the Portuguese, "to conjugate the verb *rapio*." It has been a chequered history all the way from these far off days down to our own time. We cannot take forth the precious from the vile and pronounce judgment upon the years of relationship and responsibility, of exploitation and of unselfish service.

Yet, as we survey the whole long process, there emerge certain achievements that we can claim as in large measure due to the British connection and as permanent contributions to the fashioning of the free nation that is now being born. One of these is the unity which, though it still has fissures, makes India today, as never in the past, one people. She feels herself to be one and passionately desires that she should remain so and should overcome the discords that social injustice, of which she has been guilty, and religious passions have produced. That this is so is undoubtedly the consequence in the main of the firmness and impartiality of British rule. A second contribution of supreme value that Britain may claim to have made to the India of the future, is the creation throughout the land of respect for law and for the courts of justice that administer it. The highest judicial posts are filled now and have been filled in recent times by men who, whether Indian or British, recognise that the administration of justice stands above and outside of politics and who have the courage to act accordingly. This tradition may be said to be well established in India and it will be carried forward into the new era and will help greatly to stabilise it.

Further, it can be claimed that through the teaching of English history and English literature in the colleges of India the democratic tradition has become so naturalised in the minds of the intelligentsia as to determine their political outlook. It is true that the emphasis that higher education has placed upon English culture has led to neglect of their own Indian heritage, but that has been corrected in recent years by the nationalist awakening without, however, extinguishing their acquired democratic faith.

A fourth contribution that cannot be wholly distinguished from the three that have been named, but that goes beyond them in its spiritual significance, is the creation—also in the awakened classes—of what we may describe as the Christian atmosphere which many of them have learned almost unconsciously to breathe. It is a great advance for any people when its leaders and thinkers have become able to distinguish between civilization and Christianity and to judge and condemn much that is found in the one by the standards of the other. This is so, of course, in the case of some of the greatest of India's leaders, men like G. K. Gokhale and Mahatma Gandhi and Srinivasa Sastri, as well as in the case of its greatest thinkers, such as Rabindranath Tagore and Sir Servepalli Radhakrishnan. It is seen also in the

reverence that is given by so many to those foreigners in whom they recognise the Christian spirit as the controlling force in their lives. They recognised this at once in "Mahatma" Irwin (as the Parsee Sir Phiroze Sethna called Lord Halifax when he was Viceroy) and in C. F. Andrews. It explains the trust placed by the leaders of the political parties of the first Indian Assembly in S. K. Datta as standing apart from and above political intrigue. No one can claim that British rule of India has been always Christian, but from the time of the Queen's Proclamation in 1858 to today India has been able to recognise and hail what in their rulers has had behind it the spirit of Christ. They are quick, too, to condemn what seems to them to come under His condemnation. A President of the National Congress in 1922 read in full in his presidential address the narrative of our Lord's trial, and the Christian, K. T. Paul, said of the condemnation of Mr. Gandhi in the same year, "When he was convicted, all India seemed to have become suddenly aware of the meaning of the Cross. Instinctively the mind and heart of India reverted to a similar happening in the Court of Pilate."

The present political deadlock

Thus if we have sown tares in the Indian field we have sown wheat as well. If Indians are now condemning Great Britain for failing to give them their rights, it is from those whom they condemn that they have learned what their rights are and how to demand them. Since 1917 when the Government of Mr. Lloyd George declared the purpose of Great Britain to be "the progressive realisation of responsible Government in India as an integral part of the Empire", the process of India's political education has been specifically directed towards that end. That goal—otherwise described as "Dominion Status"—of course includes full liberty to secede—if so disposed—from that Empire.

First by means of a system called "Dyarchy" set up in 1919 it was sought to provide the experience necessary for the discharge of so heavy a responsibility, and then in 1935 a second great step was taken towards implementing the promise more fully. But there can hardly be any more difficult task with which one nation can be entrusted than that of disengaging itself from its responsibilities for another nation and launching it upon freedom. This difficulty is all the greater the more the nation that is being so emancipated realises how great a gift this freedom is. It is not something that can be taken as a gift from a

condescending benefactor. The whole process of framing a constitution for free India was made intolerably difficult during the unhappy years of negotiation from 1919 to 1939 because India felt more and more that the obtaining of this new status was not a transaction of this kind. It could be no simple giving and receiving. The process is indeed full of complexities and between those who reckon themselves equals it gives an opportunity for impatience and anger on the one side, and suspicion and distrust on the other. There were reasons enough, both on Britain's part and on India's, why such discord should be aroused.

So it comes about that today, forgetting past relationships of comradeship and loyal service, Britain and India have fallen apart and their disagreement clouds the future of them both. We need each other's friendship—India ours, if she is to live secure in a dangerous world, and we India's, if our honour is not to be sadly soiled. "Next to winning the war," General Smuts has said, "the emancipation of India without internal disruption (and, we may add, without hostility towards ourselves) is perhaps the greatest prize in the world." But the Indian National Congress, claiming to speak for India, refuses to accept our largesse, protesting that "India in bondage can play no effective part in defending herself." "To change Indian ill-will to Britain into goodwill, India must be a willing partner in the war. This is only possible if India feels the glow of freedom." That is how the two nations face each other today and for both of them the aspect that the future will bear depends, above all else, on whether this ill-will can be resolved.

Indian Christians and Freedom

What the consequences—evil or good—may be that wait upon this uncertainty cannot be discussed here. All we can do is to note some attitudes that we see being assumed by one section of the Indian people and that a section with which Britain has special ties—the Christians of India. Because of these ties of friendship and a common faith they can be taken as representing a moderate view of future relations with Great Britain. As Christians they are internationalists and that fact also places some restraint upon the violence of their nationalism. They love their country even as we love ours, though they love the City of God first. Do these considerations then prevent them from joining their fellow-countrymen in their demand for freedom?

We do not find that they do. Whatever the divisions between the Indian parties—Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Parsee—all of them are agreed in demanding freedom and demand it right now, and the Christians, of whom there are nearly eight millions now in India, are at one in this matter with their fellow-Indians.

This fact can best be indicated by some quotations from declarations made by representative Christian organisations and by representative individuals. In July of last year the All-India Council of Indian Christians declared that "the immediate attainment of complete freedom" was "essential for India's national life and integrity", and deplored the failure of the British Government to meet this demand. They differed from the National Congress only in their opposition to civil disobedience. In this declaration "Protestant" and "Catholic" Christians are in full agreement. Among the Protestant "nationalists" the Bishop of Dornakal is the most outstanding and the most honoured figure. He is as closely bound to India, "his brethren, his kinsmen according to the flesh", as St. Paul was to Israel, but at the same time he remembers that nationalism is not enough. He has placed himself not only beside his non-Christian fellow-countrymen in their political demands, but also beside his fellow-Christians of the West, believing, as he says, that "in spite of elements of self-interest in Britain" the leaders of the Church there "are alive to their vocation to be the conscience" of the nation. He calls on the Indian Christians to play the same part in India.

The impatience of youth

It is natural that the younger elements in the Christian Church should be most outspoken in their censure of us and indeed we are told by Mr. E. C. Dewick, who writes with intimate knowledge of the Indian student, that the resolutions passed at Student Christian Movement camps generally demand complete independence for India "as vehemently as any other section of 'Young India' ". Nor does this rising tide of impatience limit itself to the political sphere. One of the largest of the Christian Councils, that have so large a part in shaping the missionary policy in India, recently passed a resolution urging that "at a time when the future of the country is dark" missionary organisations should, "without waiting to be forced to do so by external circumstances, . . . transfer all control and authority into the hands of the people of the land." "By so doing they will have the satisfaction of demonstrating in a concrete manner the

demand in the country for the withdrawal of foreign personnel." In a private letter a wise and experienced Indian, who has large responsibilities in connection with the National Christian Council, gives the warning: "Whether this movement will stop (at the demand to 'quit control') or go further, I cannot say at present. I have grave misgivings."

Thus the determination to stand up upon their own feet as free men is evidently spreading from the political sphere to every department of the country's life. Political freedom is already theirs since it has been declared by the Prime Minister to be "the settled policy of the British Crown and Parliament". This issue only awaits final adjustment as soon as the war ends. In regard to the policy of the Churches of the West a rearrangement of relationships must be carried through with cordiality and without delay and solely with a view to the highest interests of the Christian people. There will be many grave problems that will have to be faced in the India that is being now re-born. No doubt, full religious freedom will be difficult to secure and to preserve when it is a Christian minority that is claiming it. Nevertheless, since the Christian people and the Christian Church are prepared to face these perils, it is well that they should do so.

It may be that we shall all find reason to agree with an Indian Christian Professor, Mr. S. C. Sircar, when he finds in all these events that seem to us disquieting "cause for profound gratitude to God and an opportunity to realise our debt to foreign missions, and to prepare ourselves for the greater responsibilities that lie ahead of us." If that is the spirit in which not the Christians only, but all India faces the new day, then Britain and India shall be able, separate but side by side, to march on undismayed.

The Church and the Indian Tragedy

SURJIT SINGH

". . . The more I studied the character of Christ in the Gospels, the less I felt ready to defend the methods of the West in its treatment of the East, whether in Church of State."[1]—C. F. Andrews.

The reader is requested to bear in mind that this article deals with a very limited span of time. This is more true as far as the Church is concerned. It would be therefore very unfair to judge the activities and the contributions of the Church from this severely limited perspective. We are here concerned with a very recent phase of political life in India.

Some years ago I went to see the late C. F. Andrews at Simla. Among other questions I asked him one about the future role of the Indian Church in the national situation. The best beloved Englishman replied with characteristic simplicity and humility: "The role of the Church is to be a bridge between the Hindus and the Muslims. Its true function is that of reconciliation." He himself performed the ministry of reconciliation between India and Britain. His reply, which came to me as the advice of a devoted servant of God, has stayed with me, although he has gone ahead. His words were not devoid of content, they had the backing of a life of service and untiring devotion to suffering humanity.

Has the Church then failed to fill the need for a mediator? Has she stayed out of the turmoil and occupied a balcony seat above the march of historical events? Or has she shown her profound concern for what is happening and has happened? To these questions answers can only be given by evaluating the recent events in India and the Church's reaction to them. What then is the Indian scene in its contemporary setting?

Recent history

Too much has happened recently to permit us to go far back into the past. For our purpose we will start with the war. Before the war India enjoyed what is called Provincial autonomy,

[1] *What I Owe to Christ* (1932) p. 167.

the government at the centre being controlled by the India Act of 1919, in view of the non-acceptance of the federal part of the India Act of 1935. In eight provinces out of eleven the Indian Nationalist Congress was the majority party. The other three provinces had coalition governments. With the commencement of war, the Viceroy declared India belligerent without consulting the people. Technically the Viceroy did not do anything unconstitutional. The constitution had empowered him to throw the country into war or keep it out. But there was a moral element involved in the situation. Here were the people of the country who were supposed to be enjoying a substantial form of autonomous government. But when the fate of their country is going to be decided they are not even consulted much less given the chance to say yes or no. Does not this mean that the autonomy was a farce and not real authority? For if it was real autonomy, how could the British authorities by-pass us? Failing to seek redress for this national insult, the Congress declined to carry on government. In these provinces the constitution is now suspended and the Viceroy rules with the iron rod.

In the meantime the Congress showed its willingness to co-operate with the Government in the war effort on the condition that India be declared an independent country. In August 1940 the Government of India presented some proposals in the form of a White Paper in which India's future independence was recognised, but it left the present status of India wholly undefined. Those proposals were rejected.

Meanwhile the Axis had the better of the Allies in all the theatres of war. With the reverses in the Far East, and Libya, the passage of the German ships through the English Channel, and the joining of Russia in the war a new situation arose, and an old figure with a new status entered the diplomatic game. The situation demanded a new formula for the Indian aspirations and with the reshuffle in the Churchill Cabinet, the man of the moment, Sir Stafford Cripps, was included in the cabinet as the Lord Privy Seal and Mr. Churchill's personal spokesman in the House of Commons. It is curious to note that nobody even thought of removing the symbol of the "steel framework" of domination, namely, the India Office. One wondered even at that time whether this new patch on the old garment was going to do the trick or widen the rent. History is the better judge and we shall let it decide.

The Cripps mission

When the Japanese had almost conquered Burma, Sir Stafford flew over to India with his proposals. He opened discussions with two presuppositions: firstly, the proposals should be accepted or rejected *in toto;* secondly, no major constitutional changes could be made at that time in view of the war and its complexities. In the first place these statements implied that the people had no alternatives to choose from and that in the drafting of the proposals they were not consulted, although they should be the party to contribute constructively toward the drawing up of a constitution for the simple reason that they were the ones who were going to work it out in their day to day existence. Secondly, these statements presupposed adequate, if not complete, knowledge of the nature of Indian demands and still failed to satisfy them. These statements therefore were to forestall any drastic demands that the Indian people might make. It seems, therefore, quite intelligible that we started from the very beginning with a constitutional deadlock, with the incompatibility of grants and demands. According to Professor Coupland, these proposals, although they did not go beyond those of August 1940 in principle, yet had a broader scope for workability and co-operation. The Congress with few criticisms postponed the discussion of the proposals dealing with post-war India and concentrated on the present, banking on the possibility that if the present turns out to the fulfilment of their dreams, the future will take care of itself. The Government on the other hand was very eloquent, although by no means unambiguous on the post-war status of India, but its proposals dealing with the present role of India were very nebulous.

The Congress was of the opinion that the masses of India should be made to feel that this was the people's own war. That they were fighting to preserve freedom at home as well as abroad. This the Congress strongly felt could be done only by a peoples' Government composed of their own representatives. This National Government should have the popular and civil control of the machinery of government. They expressed the desire of leaving military operations and higher strategy in the hands of the British commander-in-chief who would be responsible for these to the British war cabinet. The Government on the other hand, admitting the force of the Nationalists' argument, insisted that instead of a Provisional National Government with full cabinet powers, there should this time be a rather enlarged

Viceroy's Executive Council. The Government proposed fifteen members, eleven of whom should be Indians. The Government believed that this was the best way the Indian people could co-operate in the war. The members of the Viceroy's Council are non-official and have a purely advisory capacity. They are responsible to the Viceroy and not to the central Legislature. The Viceroy himself is not responsible to anybody in India.

This to the mind of the Congress was a continuation of the old regime and the thwarting of their treasured aspirations. By including more Indian members in the services, the British Government has succeeded in conveying the impression that the Government is actually being run by the people and that they have autonomous powers. This is not true. What has really happened is that the seat of authority is now filled with fewer British but with the same ruling powers. The smaller number of British has not led to the concrete sharing of authority with the Indians. The large number of Indians without any solid control of the machinery of government has really served as a camouflage for the bureaucracy whose authority is all the more firmly entrenched.

The mission fails

The Congress proposal however that there should be an Indian Secretary of War by the side of a British Army Chief of Staff implied explicitly a transforming of Indo-British relationship from mistrust and bitterness into trust and comradeship. It required a bold and imaginative handling of historical forces. The Indian proposal set forth a new attitude, for in any national situation the civil and the military authorities have to co-operate. And this presupposes trust and confidence in each other. This the British Government was not prepared to do. Sir Stafford fell short of his own bold utterance in which he proposed that "there will still be difficulties, perhaps, as a result of the distrust which has grown up between us in past years, but I ask you to turn your backs upon that past, to accept my hand, our hand of friendship and trust, and to allow us to join with you for the time being in working to establish and to complete your freedom and your self-government." This simply means that Sir Stafford and the Government he represented wanted us to turn our back on the past and be transformed from a sceptical into a credulous people, but he and his Government would not do so.

It is because of bitter distrust and lack of confidence that the negotiations broke down and not that constitutional changes were

not possible and that the rights of the minorities had to be protected, an argument which, by the way, was not presented by the negotiating parties during the course of discussions. Whereas the negotiations between the Congress and the Government broke down on the basis of distrust, the other parties also rejected the proposals for one reason or another.

In all fairness it should be acknowledged that the official British position is that the negotiations did not break down because of the British Government's unwillingness to part with power, but rather because of the disunity of the various Indian parties. This sounds strange in the face of hard facts bearing witness to the contrary position. All the Indian parties were unanimous in getting freedom from Britain. All of them were in favour of an interim arrangement in which real authority should be shared with the Indians. Their disagreements were not based on the provisional National Government but rather what might happen in the permanent form of Government. The people of India clearly showed by the trend of their discussions that their interest at the time was more immediate and it was the Government's inability to do anything about the immediate circumstances that finally led to the collapse.

What is meant by unity?

The most astonishing thing is that the official spokesmen by broadcasting that the deliberations foundered on the rock of disunity, have discredited their age-old claim that they have given unity to India. What kind of a unity is this? From their own argument it is obvious that they have not given India a unity of politico-economic outlook. It is also more than apparent that India has a cultural unity of her own. What then is this unity that our British rulers have given us? It is probably the unity of common subjection based on an extensive system of transportation and backed up by modern means of coercion. Is this an achievement that anybody should be proud of? Only an imperialist can take pride in such an automaton structure. For the ruled it is not an achievement but it can become a framework for achievement if the ruler leaves his country in an orderly fashion. The ruler cannot take away with him the system of communication which has connected the unknown parts of the country to the known. But did the original imperialist motives of the ruler anticipate such a development?

"The British,"[1] says Nehru, "gave political unity to India. This had now become possible owing to the development of communication and transport. It was a unity of a common subjection, but it gave rise to the unity of common nationalism. . . . It was not a superficial idea imposed from above, but the natural outcome of that fundamental unity which had been the background of Indian life for thousands of years."

Justice and democracy

It may not be out of place here, although it is a slight digression from the main trend of the article, to discuss some of the other British achievements as listed by Dr. Macnicol. It is maintained that the British have given us law and justice and the institutions that administer it. The administration, it is maintained, is impartial. It should be acknowledged with gratefulness that it is so. Only one qualification enters in. The application of law and justice is impartial on a local scale and may also be vindicated on a communal scale; but the British Government's sense of justice weakens considerably when it becomes a party against the Indian Nation. The example that comes to mind is very recent and is still fresh in many minds. The Chief Justice of India, bound by the code of law, announced that the arrest of Gandhi and Nehru and several thousand others, held in jail a little less than a year without trial under Section 26 was invalid. The Chief Justice proved himself above politics and vindicated the British conception of justice, but the British Government did not think that was justice. Consequently by considering itself above law it invoked a higher law! But is it a higher law? And does it do justice to the British conception of law and fair-play? This has happened every time the Government has been a party against the nation. And who can count such emergencies?

It is noted that the teaching of English history and literature has given us a democratic outlook. I think this is true. But what has happened? A student graduating from an Indian college knows more about English history and literature than Indian history and thought tradition. He is now acquainted with a democratic tradition but the background to which he should apply it he does not know very much about. The result is that he becomes an agitator only on the basis of some principles and not a revolutionary statesman. This is very clear from the history of the Indian National Congress from 1885 to 1918. It was

[1] *The Unity of India*, 1941, p. 19.

simply a movement of agitation. But after that when the Congress got in touch with the masses and found out the method to relate the democratic tradition to their needs it became a constructive and successful revolution. It also became an object of dread to the Government and the Government now wishes that such a movement had never set its foot on the stage of existence.

Dr. Macnicol also ventures the suggestion that the creation of what may be called a Christian atmosphere in India is due to the British connection. We fail to understand this. There is no doubt that the British missionaries have taken part in it, but to attribute it "in large measure" to the British connection and to mention it in such a context is hardly true to facts. The creation of a Christian atmosphere in India is the result of the missionary outreach of the Church of Jesus Christ in which the British missionaries have certainly played their part.

One very palpable result of the failure of Cripps' mission is the increased distrust and bitterness between the British Government and the Indian people. Professor Coupland records vividly that his Indian audiences listened to whatever he had to say with rapt attention yet at the end remained unconvinced and did not believe what he was saying. Many things have happened between now and then and unfortunately they have all made their contributions to the reservoir of hatred and distrust. We are diverging more and more away from any meeting place. The fact is that there is a fundamental disparity between our sense of fitness to rule and the self-appointed judges of our destiny who legislate what we should do rather than what we are capable of doing.

Here emerges an important principle by which the constitutional development of India is governed. I give it in the words of Mr. Churchill, where he is defending his stand against giving Dominion Status to India. "In the very Act of Parliament in 1919 where responsible government is mentioned in the preamble there is also a special clause, Clause 41, which makes it plain that all progress towards responsible government must only be at the discretion of the British Parliament, and that Parliament can, if it chooses, stop the progress, or slow it down, or turn it into another channel, or even retrace our path if that were necessary. Therefore, until another Act of Parliament receives the Royal assent, there is no ground whatever on which we are committed to any particular step at any particular time."[1] This means that

[1] *India—Speeches by W. S. Churchill*, p. 80, (1931).

India would be held in the interests of Britain indefinitely irrespective of the capabilities and administrative genius of the people of India. Mr. Churchill has no wish to hide this sentiment, therefore we will let him speak for himself: "Above all, it must be made plain that the British Nation has no intention of relinquishing its mission in India, or of failing in its duty to the Indian masses, or of parting with its supreme control in any of the essentials of peace, order and good government."[1] "With every mark of honour and dignity we have welcomed the aid and co-operation of eminent men among our Indian fellow-subjects. But except as an ultimate visionary goal, Dominion status like that of Canada or Australia is not going to happen to India in any period which we can even remotely foresee."[2] Should we believe that a change of heart has taken place? At least Sir Stafford Cripps wanted us to believe so. But statements made in 1941 excluding India from the Atlantic Charter, and "We fight to hold our own. I am not appointed His Majesty's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire," made in 1943, make it plain beyond a shadow of doubt that the old policies still stand, though in a slightly modified form and under a new name. The apologists have tried to rationalise these statements; but why the apologists, where one statement by the Prime Minister to the contrary can dispel all doubts? The Government's present attitude to Mahatma Gandhi and the movement for Indian freedom is also very well summed up in the words of Mr. Churchill: "The truth is that Gandhi-ism and all it stands for will, sooner or later, have to be grappled with and finally crushed."[3] At that time Mr. Churchill was not in power but he is now and the dust tells us which way the wind is blowing.

The missionary enterprise and national freedom

Has the Church anything to say to this situation or is it too secular to command her attention? What has the Church to say to the statement of the Madras Guardian regarding the foreign missionaries, "Few of those, who admonished us that the present war is a war for democracy and freedom, did anything to prove that the Gospel had a relevance to India."[4]

The history of foreign missionary enterprise bears out the

[1] P. 47.
[2] *India—Speeches by W. S. Churchill,* p. 80.
[3] Ibid., p. 46.
[4] *Madras Guardian,* May 14, 1942.

fact that Christianity has been introduced into foreign lands either through its own strength and good will of the people it was taken to or it has followed in the wake of a politico-economic conquest of a weaker people by a strong industrial power. Both of these methods have been true of India. The earliest Christian work has the support of the first method. But the modern missionary era was ushered in by the politico-economic conquests made possible by the blind pursuit of the logic of the Industrial Revolution. Missions in the modern era have been the allies of their conquering governments and have been quiescent when a stand should have been taken against the unchristian policies of their nations. Mr. Philip says, "It is pathetic that in all the history of modern European missions there is no single instance of missions lending their moral and spiritual support to people who were stuggling to attain freedom from European rule."[1] The late Mr. C. F. Andrews who lived his life in untiring sympathetic relationship with the Indian people also says, ". . . I found in missionary efforts as they were carried on in India the conventional touch of a religious imperialism which had the same blighting effect on the inner self-determination of Indian Christians as the ordinary political imperialism had upon Indians who were not Christians."[2]

What can one say of such a situation?—only that it is a contradiction of the greatest type. The Gospel of Jesus Christ, the truth whose knowledge makes people free is caged in the iron-cast of politico-economic imperialism. In such a situation there is a pull of polarities—"the truth" wants to free itself but self-interest would suppress it. This is living under tension. Here is the chance for the "demonic"—the form-destroying and the form-creating principle.[3] Whereas the emissaries of truth have compromised with the existing regime, its recipients have rebelled against it. No wonder that urges for freedom have been based on and born out of the soul-freeing message of the Gospel. The Gospel has been the backbone of the appeals of the suppressed people for their freedom.[4] This is then the Church's hour of trial. Will she rise to the occasion?

The Church outside of India has failed to understand and relate itself to the Indian situation. If she has understood, then

[1] *Christendom*, Winter 1942.
[2] *India and the Simon Report*, p. 115.
[3] *The Interpretation of History*, by Paul Tillich.
[4] This is the present writer's justification for writing this article.

she does not have the courage to do something about it. It is learnt that the National Christian Council of India sent an appeal to the meeting of the Federal Council of Churches, Cleveland, Ohio, asking them to plead with the United States Government to find ways and means of easing the Indian impasse. The appeal has been lightly treated and no practical concern has been shown for the grave crisis. A few churchmen and missionaries have tried to do something but theirs has been the voice in the wilderness. On the other hand churchmen of the eminence of Dr. J. H. Oldham seem to have fallen prey to a subtle rationalisation of British imperialism. Instead of making common cause with Christian forces in offering repentance for the guilt of exploitation, he persuades us to believe that the British Empire is the right-hand ally of the Kingdom of God, because it is a growing organism and is unfolding itself toward the full freedom and the liberty of the "sons of God"![1]

In India missionaries like J. Holme Smith and Ralph Templin have taken a definite stand and have borne its consequences. Men like Stanley Jones have spoken out clearly what has been on their minds for some time. Many other missionaries both known and unknown to the writer have expressed their sympathy and concern. But the rank and file of the missionary community in India has not shown any appreciation of the nationalist's stand. They have been indifferent either deliberately or because of the inability to revise their old political ideas. Nobody is trying to urge that the missionary should put on the jacket of a politician. All that is required by the exigencies of the situation is that the Gospel be constructively related to the Indian scene. This the missionary has failed to do. He therefore has kept back a large number of Christians coming directly under his influence from relating Christianity creatively to the Indian situation. Dr. Hodge addressing the missionaries on this question says, "I would enter only one caveat: while you may inform and stimulate indigenous thinking please let the people, Christian and non-Christian form their own conclusions and express them in their own way."[2] The enlightened Indian Christians, however, have taken a very progressive stand and have shown themselves alive to the implications of the situation. In "An Indian Christian Manifesto"[3] referring to the question of minorities regarding

[1] *Christian Century,* February 3, 1943.
[2] *National Christian Council Review,* August 1942, p. 319.
[3] *The National Christian Review,* June 1942, pp. 262, 263.

which they criticised the Government, they say, "We agree that our proper court of appeal in this matter is our own countrymen rather than the Government in England. . . ." With reference to the vital and all important question of defence, their stand is also very significant: "We are disappointed that the important subject of Defence is not to be handed over to a non-official Indian member. We cannot contemplate that any responsible Indian Defence Minister would interfere unnecessarily or unwisely in the conduct of military operations, or hamper unduly the legitimate discharge of his duties by the Commander-in-chief. On the other hand, without the concession asked for, it will not be possible to secure the full co-operation of Indians in the war effort."

A Challenge to British and Indian Christians

All events, so far as we know them, conspire to tell us that the question of Indian freedom will remain a closed issue during the war at least, if not after it. This is not at all an appropriate solution of affairs. People might be given to understand that the situation is well in hand, but in the outwardly static scene there are dynamic forces of action and reaction. They will add to the already existent problems and dry out the reservoir of goodwill if there is anything like that still left over. Indians are also convinced that the freedom for which they are fighting will not come to them at the end of war; they still will have to fight for it. This will make the desperate situation all the worse for handling.

In the midst of such misgivings there seems to be only one beacon of light, the Church, unless her light is stamped out by local and national loyalties. She has the foundation and necessary qualifications to restore goodwill and healthy relationships between conflicting parties. Even at this last hour British and Indian Church statesmen can rise to the occasion and avert the final tragedy. Their task is difficult. They cannot approach hard historical facts only with high sounding formulas. They will have to apply their vision of Christ and His kingdom, which gives them a vantage point far above national affiliations, to the concrete situation in hand. This I believe is possible. It has not been tried. But if we did not try and gave up hope, would it not be a judgment on our Christianity—a judgment displaying the impotence of Christianity to create people who can transcend their local and national loyalties?

News Out of China

An Interview by Helen Morton

Lyman Hoover is just back from China by plane via India and Africa. He saw Augustine Ralla Ram in Calcutta. He brings news and messages of many kinds. He had a three weeks' delay in West Africa, where he found a long list of important people waiting for passage. But he arrived in New York well and cheerful.

The question was put to him almost immediately: Will you please write an article for the next issue of The Student World? But those who plan travel schedules had worked even faster. There was no time left. He had already broken into his trips to get to the Federation officers' meeting outside New York. An article couldn't be done. So the next best is to report a conversation about news from China which took place when he was in New York. What follows is the best substitute for what might have been an article!

Kung Pu-Sheng (Y.W.C.A. Secretary): Lyman, seeing you makes me feel homesick. I've been waiting so many months now for a sailing. All the inoculations I've had will begin to wear off if I don't get started soon! What's the news from Chungking?

Lyman Hoover (Y.M.C.A. Secretary): There'll be a warm welcome for you when you get back. The staff is so depleted, and everyone has more than he can possibly do. Shih Pao-Chen was married on February 12th to Dr. Ch'en Si-K'ang. They live at Pisan, so Pao-Chen can come to student headquarters in Chungking for only a few days each month. Julia Ch'eng helps greatly in the Student Relief Administrative work. Huang Su-Chi is still here in the States, but her return to China is awaited eagerly. Kiang Wen-Han has felt very short of colleagues, especially since Yu P'ei-Wen has been away on extended local visits at Kunming and now at Kwangsi University. Li Chu-Wen has now become student secretary at Kunming. We have drafted Ellsworth Carlson of Oberlin to take my place as Administrative Secretary of the National Student Relief Com-

mittee. We've had to battle with problems of ill health, too. It is hard for staff members, both Chinese and foreign, to keep well against the obstacles of high living costs, inadequate food and pressure of work.

When you do get off, Kung Pu-Sheng, remember about the typewriters! The last ones we bought in Chungking cost many thousands of Chinese dollars. You will have to ship them in from India. And be sure to take in as many vitamin pills as you can carry. These are very much in demand, and they help a great deal in keeping people well. I wish more could be done about this. We have had practically none for the past two years. Maybe there would be some Associations here which could make it their special interest to provide and send larger quantities of such pills.

It's been fine having Paul Moritz come back to us from the U.S.A. For twelve years now we've been asking for more man power for our permanent "fraternal" staff and this is the first man the American Y.M.C.A. has been able to send. It raises our hopes that there may be more soon. We need them greatly. David Paton from Britain is doing an excellent job helping Wen-Han in Chungking, as well as serving as Chaplain for the student center at Shapingba. He claims he is completely unpopular with the bugs of that latter place, where the others suffer a great deal from these pests! He has been taking special responsibility for certain national projects in our work, especially evangelism and Bible study.

Helen Morton: What are the main concerns of the Student Christian Movement now? Are the fourfold emphases adopted at the last national meeting still in force?

Lyman Hoover: Yes they are, very decidedly so. There's been no national meeting since 1939, so that no changes have been made, but, in spite of that, I believe they'd still go on with them for they seem to fit our present convictions and interests as a movement. I'll go over some of them with you, just so you can see that they have been given new meaning by the present circumstances.

The first emphasis is KNOW CHRISTIANITY. For this we have had two travelling teams which have done very effective work—Kiang Wen-Han and Andy Roy in the Northwest, S. C. Leung and Victor Hayward in the Southeast. In the course of these trips they went to 47 colleges and reached over 33,000

students. Special attention was given to many isolated centers. You can imagine for yourself some of the difficulties in travelling in the interior these days. They used every sort of transport—buses, and mules, and chairs—but both teams fulfilled their schedules.

People ought to know also about the fine work that has been developed in these past three years in the isolated universities. Student centers manned by full-time secretaries are functioning at Shapingba and Kiating in Szechwan, Chengtu in Shensi, Tsunyi in Kweichow, Liangfeng in Kwangsi, and Pingshek in Kwangtung. Other centers have been established with the special help of church or faculty workers at National Honan University, Northwest Agricultural College, Northwest Medical College, Northeastern University, etc. In addition there is a very busy center on the campus of West China Christian University in Chengtu and another adjoining National Southwest Associated University at Kunming. This has been a most important part of the national program, and has been made possible by the generous backing of the Churches in China and abroad.

Helen Morton: What about the Days of Prayer in the life of the Chinese S.C.M.?

Lyman Hoover: The two days of Prayer, in February with the W.S.C.F. and again in April—our Sino-Japanese day, have been important events for us. John, Chapter 17, was the central thought used for the latter this year:

> "I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. . . Sanctify them through thy truth . . . that they may be one, even as we are one."

These Days of Prayer are not just the outward observance of a service of worship. There are times when we struggle with the tragic divisions which separate us. Our hopes are fixed on the ability of prayer to open our eyes to the powers against which we are struggling—the power of fear and war, the power of national pride and propaganda, the power of injustice and lack of love. We try through these periods of worship to see more sharply the moral and spiritual issues we face as Christians. We see prayer not as a means of ignoring difficulties, nor of escaping, nor of

glossing over things, but as a way to confront us with the dilemma and to make more sharp the choices we must make.

The struggle against evil is dramatised for us in the circumstances of university life as we find it. Because of the war of resistance most Chinese students live in poverty and lack many essentials for health and study. We know that students in Europe and even in the United States are suffering for their convictions. We find our students in China may have to suffer for the right to study and discuss the facts about economic and political reconstruction. Chinese students are living in the midst of an uneasy political situation. Students feel that many restraints and restrictions have been put upon student life and thought. The academic schedule seems often to be deliberately filled so full that there is virtually no time left for any extra-curricular activity. Discussions about some subjects are said to be dangerous and those who have taken part in them may disappear from the university, both faculty and students. There is a marked tendency to control thought in a given direction. To resist the trend—and to read and discuss and to learn so that we may form true and just judgments—is in some places becoming a dangerous occupation, for which a high cost may have to be paid. Students long to achieve the freedom of truth but that is not a simple task. Chinese Christian students take strength and encouragement from the realisation of their fellowship and their oneness through Jesus Christ with the members of the many other student Christian movements in the W.S.C.F.

Kung Pu-Sheng: What progress is being made on the second emphasis: KNOW THE TIMES IN WHICH WE LIVE?

Lyman Hoover: We begin to know the times, certainly, through living under the kind of political and economic pressures surrounding us in these years. Many Chinese students feel keenly that the struggle against aggression from without is of one piece with the struggle for democracy within the country. While some would accept war-time emergencies as justification for many restrictions, others are standing for the recognition of democracy during the struggle itself as the best guarantee of its continuation beyond the war. These students believe in as representative a government as possible, more use by the government of the intelligentsia, more education of the people to vote and share in government, everything which spreads more widely the real responsibility and control.

Helen Morton: Were the questions[1] the officers sent you in November for discussion helpful in this emphasis?

Lyman Hoover: Yes, there has been much interest in the four questions proposed by the officers of the Federation. Opinion about the "four freedoms" is one of the questions a representative group worked over in Chungking. You may be interested to hear some of the views expressed! We felt that in some ways the four freedoms were put too negatively. Freedom from want and fear need to be given positive content. "What do the principles of the Atlantic Charter mean in the Pacific?" is repeatedly asked. Some fear that the United States will seek a balance of power strategy, in which certain powers will be granted to Japan to offset powers which it is feared China might obtain. Public opinion in China does not favour replacing Japan's will to rule the Pacific by China's doing the same. China wants its own rights safeguarded. It wants to get along with its neighbors without a constant fear of war. Towards Japan, the attitude expressed is that the present government must be crushed, but that the Japanese people should have the same rights and safeguards as the Chinese people. We have consistently made a distinction between the government and the people themselves.

We know that there must be clearer understanding about the meaning of equality. It has not yet been made clear what the United Nations have in mind as to the treatment of "backward" and "more advanced" areas in the Far East. China is committed to a firm organisation of international life on a basis of long-term and equal co-operation and mutual responsibility.

"Knowing the times" also means taking active part in civic affairs. The Christians, who are a very small minority, are carrying a share of responsible work out of all proportion to their number. One can usually count on the Christian leaders in the government to take a constructive attitude towards the vari-

[1] i. What should be the future relationships of countries in Asia and Africa to the so-called western countries? What is the significance of "the four freedoms" in the total world situation?

ii. How can constructive relationships between the U.S.S.R. and other nations be assured? What is the part of Christians in this matter?

iii. What are the basic convictions about the nature of a future world order which Christians hold in common? How can we find these in our study of the Bible, and state them clearly?

iv. What should be the function of the university in the post-war world? How can Christian individuals and movements within the university be related to this function?

ous political groups. Sometimes the Christians act as mediators between the Communists and the non-Communists. They have by and large made great efforts to establish and maintain friendly relations, and to provide a chance for free discussion and greater understanding of the differences and common concerns for China's welfare.

Kung Pu-Sheng: Before I left China we were working hard on the third emphasis, INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP.

Lyman Hoover: That third emphasis is particularly meaningful to us now. Aside from the Student Relief funds which we have received, contacts with friends from other countries have dwindled to nothing since the universities moved to the interior. We are isolated as we have never been before. So we reach out for everything which keeps us in touch with others. The news sheets and magazines which have come through to us have been treasures. Helen, we hope the Federation staff will tell everyone outside China to be extravagant if necessary in mailing us materials about student thought and life; tell them to cut off all the margins and extra bits of paper, and mail us all they can afford to send.[1] We appreciate everything we get as we never have before. Things which come are passed around from person to person, and school to school. They are copied and reproduced on primitive duplicators which would make you both laugh and cry if you could see them!

Kung Pu-Sheng: I've noticed the difference as I have travelled in North America, between our attitude in China and the attitude of students in American colleges. I am most cordially received everywhere, but there are so many visitors from other countries, that my coming is just one more visitor. I am considered slightly as a curiosity, and am usually asked to say something in Chinese, and my clothes are of interest. In China, every outside contact is precious as a means of getting news and feeling the lines of thought and interest, which we crave knowing so much. I believe our sense of the reality of the Federation goes deeper than that of many American students.

Lyman Hoover: The fourth and last emphasis is SELF-DEDICATION. A full time secretary, Victor Hayward (an old British S.C.M. member), has been assigned to help the student leaders develop a program best fulfilling this emphasis.

[1] Mr. Kiang Wen-Han, 38 Chung Hsueh Kai, Tan-tze-shih, South Bank, Chungking, Free China.

He also represents the Church of Christ in China and the National Christian Council. The Nanking Theological Seminary is also collaborating. The headquarters for this work are in Chengtu. The results this past year have been several hundred enlistments by students for Christian service in China. There are two kinds of enlistment—a red or a white card kind. One is for full time service in the Christian movement itself, the other the choice of a life career on a basis of Christian service toward meeting China's needs in all walks of life.

One of the natural reactions to the suffering and deprivation which have oppressed so many students, is to make them want a job which offers an adequate salary to buy the comforts which have been lacking. For many workers in the Church, S.C.M. and other needed callings, there is little or no prospect of ever having enough salary for comforts. Quite the reverse. The cost of living has become so inflated—it takes practically all of a month's salary just for a room to live in. Look at the Far Eastern Vice-Chairman of the Federation! Kiang Wen-Han used to live in a home in Green Villa, Shanghai, which would be called comfortable even according to North American standards. By successive degrees, as the cost of living has gone up, he has changed his family quarters from one place to another, each time less comfortable but more expensive. Right now all he can afford is a one-room clay and bamboo "cottage" with a curtain in the middle to make some pretence at dividing it into two rooms. No running water, no modern conveniences. He and Mrs. Kiang use a little carbide lamp at night with so dim a flame that when anyone wants anything from another part of the house, the lamp must be carried along and the others wait in darkness until it is brought back! Yet that cottage cost them thousands of dollars in Chinese money. Mrs. Kiang has to work outside while the children are at school to help make ends meet.

One of our former secretaries told me of the Dean of a certain college—a very distinguished man in his field, now well on in years—whom he had visited at various times. The first time, the Dean met him in an automobile. The second time the Dean had given up his automobile, but had a private rickshaw of his own. The third time the Dean had been forced to give up his rickshaw, and was using the ordinary ones at the corner. Now he no longer can afford even to use a rickshaw, but has to walk everywhere he goes.

At one university, where funds were being raised for a student conference, it was suggested that, after the students had given all they could, the faculty be asked to contribute. But the students pointed out that the nearby pawn shops were filled with the possessions of the faculty; they had so little of anything left that they couldn't even give as much as the students!

But few complain. They show their good spirits and willingness to accept all these discomforts in their attitude towards work. Students used to look down on manual labour. It wasn't done. There were others in China to do the menial jobs. But now that has changed. There are still the others, but students consider it their patriotic duty to be at work, and to do the menial tasks. Besides working their way through college, they do village reconstruction work, and border service, gardening, nurse the sick and wounded, care for orphans and all kinds of similar things. Andy Roy and his group in Chengtu have a goat raising project, providing milk for the tubercular students. They also grow vegetables for the student mess halls. Many universities are taking up similar self-help projects.

Kung Pu-Sheng: Oh, Lyman, just to hear you makes me all the more homesick. I feel as if I were back in China already. Can't you pull some wires for me so I can get back all the sooner?

The Japanese S.C.M. in War Time

Russell L. Durgin

The almost complete silence from the Student Christian Movement in Japan for a year and a half has not meant that Christian work among students there has come to an end. The trends recorded with considerable insight by Tsunegoro Nara in The Student World, Fourth Quarter, 1941, continued (more or less) to characterise the situation at least up till June 1942 when it became necessary for me to leave Japan.

The first term of the new school year in the spring of 1942 found the colleges still crowded with students. In many of the colleges the proportion of those applying for admission, as compared with those who could be accepted, was as high as ten to one. The policy of allowing college students to remain in school till they graduated from their regular course was still in force, although there had been a considerable acceleration of the time schedule through shortened vacation periods. The "New Structure", as applied to the colleges, was working out as predicted, with all the extra-curricular activities, including athletic, social, cultural and religious groups under the direct control of the President's office. All horizontal relations which meant student contact with intercollegiate activities or with organisations off the campus were strictly regulated or prohibited. It may well be pointed out here, however, that no student Y.M.C.A. or Y.W.C.A. was forced to disband or discontinue its work because of its Christian nature; where this took place it was simply in accord with this general policy which applied alike to all student organisations.

In some of the colleges the Christian Association did suffer, especially where the group was small or weak, or where there was no strong Christian faculty member for the required leadership. In the majority of cases the former student Y.M.C.A. group was able to carry on its work, although on a somewhat modified basis. In working out the details of the required changes with respect to name, organisational relationships and individual contacts, new patterns of approach had to be developed. No longer was it possible for a secretary to sit at his desk in the

national headquarters' office and simply write letters and send suggestions to the officially affiliated Association groups in the one hundred and thirty different colleges and universities. All service had to be carried on by actual visitation, personally contacting students and Christian professors, and working through pastors and laymen of nearby Christian churches. There was no opposition to this kind of personal approach, for Christianity had become one of the three officially recognised religions in Japan.

Christian investigation

From the standpoint of the individual college Association, the activities of the former student Y.M.C.A. in most cases took the form of the more or less officially sponsored "Bible Study Group", the "Christian Investigation Division", or (merging with other groups) the "Religious Investigation Section". All such groups constituted the Christian or the religious part of the "Cultural Department" of the over-all extra-curricular aspect of college work, and as such received from the college authorities both moral and financial support. Obviously the programme in many of the local student Associations had to be considerably modified. The major emphasis came to be along lines of an objective study approach to religion, Christianity, or even to Bible Study. In many cases, however, small groups of earnest Christian students continued to seek spiritual strength through common prayer, united devotion and in quiet personal evangelistic efforts among their fellow students. An interesting example of this was when last year, entirely through the initiative and influence of one splendid second-generation Christian student, a former missionary home located near the college campus, came to be used as a Christian hostel and soon became the center of an active student Y.M.C.A. influence.

The pastors of some of the churches located near colleges and universities were being encouraged to give more time and thought to the problems of student interest and student evangelism, and in many places student groups were making much more use of the facilities offered by the churches than had been the case under other conditions. New courage seemed to characterise the attitude of many of the Christian students, partly perhaps because of the results of the nation-wide evangelistic campaign under Dr. Kagawa's leadership and the development of the united Protestant Church of Christ in Japan. Outstanding Christian preachers

and leaders such as Dr. Toyohiko Kagawa, while not invited so much as formerly to give religious addresses in the colleges, continued to draw large numbers of students and other young people to the churches. Admission to some of Dr. Kagawa's evening meetings, which he was still being able to hold almost every night, was to be gained only through tickets sold in advance, and even then the general rule was "standing room only".

Conferences and Christian Action

During the year 1941 the different district student Y.M.C.A. conferences were not held as had been customary through the years. In their stead, however, a smaller and more devotional type of informal gathering was held in each district. These meetings were held largely in conveniently located churches and brought together those who were most deeply concerned about the spiritual problems which the students were facing. An earnestness and spiritual thirst was reported to have been characteristic of all these meetings. When I left in 1942 plans were well under way for the annual student Y.M.C.A. summer school at Gotemba, although the shortened vacation period made necessary limiting the conference last year to only a few days. The programme anticipated bringing together the results and experiences gained from the informal spring district gatherings for joint consideration and united inspiration.

In these and other ways the demands on the time and strength of the student secretaries increased greatly. It was felt by all that the times were such as to have no place for passive or negative attitudes. Aggressive and active Christian effort—both at home and in places of Japanese influence on the Asiatic mainland—characterised the younger Christian leadership in the Association and the church. During the year 1941, for instance, Rev. Yoshimune Abe, Chairman of the annual conference of the Church of Christ in Japan and former Chairman of the National Committee of the National Young Men's Christian Association, spent much of his time in China as the official representative of the United Church of Christ in Japan for the purpose of co-operating in any way possible with the Chinese Christian Church and the Christian educational institutions. This active interest on the part of the Church was reflected in the expanding sense of concern on the part of the Christian students. One evidence of the interest by Christian students along

this line was seen in the experimental summer vacation hospital and dispensary project in China which was carried on for several years by an active group of Christian medical students connected with the Japanese Y.M.C.A. movement.

Theological Interest

During the past few years, student thinking has been more or less influenced by the general theological trend which has characterised the thinking of a considerable body of the younger leadership of the church. For want of a better term, this may best be described as Barthian. Such a tendency can easily be understood, for in a time of real crisis, such as Japan and the Japanese people were passing through, it was but natural that some kind of a theology of crisis should have had its strong appeal. Two years ago the leader of the Tokyo Y.M.C.A. Student Bible Class was the Rev. H. Kuwada, outstanding exponent of the Barthian type of theology and translator of Karl Barth's *Credo,* and it was interesting to note that this theological type of Bible study attracted a larger number of just the ordinary Christian students than had any other student group for several years.

During the past decade or more a gradually growing interest in the Barthian type of theology was evident on the part of some of the younger thinkers and leaders in the Church and the seminaries, especially perhaps among the Presbyterian and Congregational ministers. Rev. H. Kuwada, Professor of Christian Theology at the Nippon Shingakko (the former Presbyterian Theological Seminary), has been one of the outstanding of such leaders, but he is not one who has in any hasty or casual way arrived at his conclusions simply because of the developing sense of crisis in the nation during a brief period of years. He is the author of such books as *The Outline of Christian Theology, The Essence of Christianity, Dialectical Theology,* and *The Understanding of Theology.* The following statement prepared quite recently by Dr. Kuwada reveals something of the processes through which his thinking has gone, as he has thought his way through to his position of leadership among the so-called Barthian theologians in Japan today.

A Japanese Theologian speaks

"During the earlier years of my thinking I came under the influence of such theologians as Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Herr-

man and John Baillie, but somehow or other I could not feel satisfied with their theological points of view. About ten years ago I came under the influence of Karl Barth and other dialectical theologians, and I have accepted some of their basic viewpoints of theology. Therefore I suppose I may be called a Barthian, although I do not like the term. I am what might be called a Barthian in the wider rather than the narrower sense of that term. I have also been influenced by the works of Calvin, Kierkegaard, Brunner, Gogarten, Bultman, Heim, Tillich, Forsyth and Denney.

"My theological viewpoint recognises the significance of the special Revelation of God in Christ, and emphasises both the Scripture and the Church. I do not agree with the fundamentalist view of the Scripture, even though I do accept the Bible as the norm of faith and doctrine. In addition I recognise the need for and the results of a scientific study of the Bible. I believe that the actual living out of Christianity is the Church. On this point perhaps I differ somewhat from both the fundamentalists and the mystics. The former places stress on doctrine, while I place greatest importance on living. The latter look upon Christianity as a present and living faith, but consider it mainly as an inner life rather than one directly concerned with the concrete and social aspects of the Christian life and faith. I look upon Christianity as both mystical and actual. I believe in the living Christ and in the Holy Spirit—the present living actuality of God—not in a mystic sense but connected with the faith of the *Church* as the body of Christ. The *Church*—both visible and invisible—is the actual abiding place of the Holy Spirit. Thus I hear the word of God through the Scripture in the Church.

"My attitude toward life and this world may be expressed in three words—faith in God, love to one's neighbours, and hope for the eschatological fulfilment. I believe that the Christian in this world should live not from the naturalistic or merely humanistic standpoint but most fundamentally through faith in God. This faith in God should be manifested in actual life and should become love expressed toward one's fellow men. We should recognise the *meaning of activity* in the present world—family, economic activity, state, civilisation, and most of all the activity of the Christian Church. But this activity does not constitute an end in itself, but as a witness and discipline looking to the fulfilment. Merely ethical Christianity, which does not include eschatology, does not give real power to the world, but in the last

analysis falls to the category of secularism and worldliness. Both eschatology and ethics are important for the true life of the real Christian."

A United Protestant Church of Japan

While the attention of some of the Christian leaders was still being directed along such lines as these during the past year or two, the general leadership of the Church was of necessity so largely concentrated on all the countless details of the mechanics and organisational problems of Church union that theological considerations were not seemingly being given first consideration. Since the fall of 1940, the outstanding leadership of the entire Church has been taxed to the limit with all the complicated discussions and negotiations involved in bringing together an unprecedented and all-embracing union of the Protestant denominations in the country. This union was not brought about because of any government order or demand, although the Religious Bodies Law, promulgated in 1940, applied to Christian communions, in like manner to all Shinto and Buddhist sects, certain requirements pertaining to registration, minimum size or recognisable religious bodies, and other matters not pertaining to doctrine or religious belief.

Indirect suggestion and social pressure, however, combined to accelerate the processes of Church union which had been developing in the Church for years. By the time of the first meeting in November, 1941, of the combined eleven sections of the united Church, a very real and wide-spread desire for Christian unity had become quite evident. Last June the consensus of informed opinion seemed to indicate that six months, rather than the previously expected three years, would be all the time that would be required to bring about an actual organically united Church of Christ in Japan. Recent news dispatches inform us that at the second annual meeting last November the realisation of this long-hoped-for result went even further than had been anticipated, for it brought most of the Episcopal Church as well as the different interdenominational service agencies, such as the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations and the Women's Christian Temperance Union, into the fold of the officially entitled CHURCH OF CHRIST IN JAPAN. This final adoption of the tentatively suggested name is in itself of considerable significance, for it emphasises the recognition of the ecumenical nature of the Church, while at the same time stand-

ing on its own feet in the midst of the present difficult situation. The recognition on the statute books of Japan of Christianity, along with Shinto and Buddhism, as one of the three officially recognised religions gave the Church new strength and confidence during this period of real crisis.

Fellowship with Missionaries

During the weeks and months after Pearl Harbor, the deep sense of appreciation on the part of many Japanese Christians for what the missionaries had meant to them and to their country was touchingly expressed in various ways to many of us who had remained till the last. The spirit of Christian fellowship, even in time of travail, which characterised the staff conference of the National Y.M.C.A. on December 8, 1941, including the one remaining American secretary, was of very real significance. Another example along this line will be of interest. A Japanese Christian friend gave a sum of money to his brother early in December with the suggestion that it be used to help take care of the needs of any of the American missionaries with whom he was in touch. In making this gesture, he said to his brother, "I do this confident that my relative in America is surely being taken care of by some good American Christian friends over there during this day of trouble."

The experiences of our last two hours in Tokyo last year made an indelible impression on my mind, for there I saw revealed the true Christian heart of a lasting Christian fellowship which transcended all boundaries. Some seventy-five of our friends had gathered at our home to bid us farewell. Just before we were to take our departure, one who is known to many readers of this article, suggested that we all join in a brief period of devotion and prayer. Following two touching and meaningful prayers, he suggested that all join in singing a hymn which has meant so much to Christians through the years. That was all, but as we departed, after a quarter of century of Christian service among the youth of Japan, leaving our home which had come to mean so much to us and to many of them, we could hear nothing but the words of that hymn ringing in our ears, and they have been echoing there ever since:

"Blest be the tie that binds
Our hearts in Christian love!
The fellowship of kindred minds
Is like to that above."

The Youth Movements in the Church Militant*

Suzanne de Dietrich

It is a serious and painful responsibility to speak about youth movements at a moment when the very substance of these movements, I mean youth itself, is so deeply threatened. When we look at the slaughter of young men in opposing armies, at the malnutrition which is slowly turning to famine, at the forced labour and mass deportations which are menacing young people, body and soul, in the occupied countries, it requires some courage to speak of the future of the youth movements. What will be left of them at the end of the war? What human material shall we have to rebuild them with? And what of the young people who have passed through these experiences—will they not have other needs, other demands than those that we can envisage today?

I heard recently a sentence spoken by a young Christian student of Berlin: "It is true, they have taken our organisations from us, but that leaves us magnificently free to create new ones." In The Student World, First Quarter, 1943, which illustrates so vividly the scope of the crisis through which the student world is passing, Arnold Nash writes that we must face the fact that we are *actually* living in a revolutionary period: "The Federation," he says, "can either accept the fact and seek under God *consciously* to guide its destiny in the world now being born or it can proceed *unconsciously* on the basis of conviction that although industry, politics, the universities, the churches and so on, must be revolutionised yet the Federation can carry on unchanged by the forces which precipitated the present cataclysm." We must not for a moment suppose that those who have gone through this time of war and revolution and who return to us, will settle down docilely into the old framework. At the same time we must not fall into the opposite error of expunging the past and expecting new movements of youth to arise *ex nihilo,* out of the conflict.

*This article is a translation of an address delivered in French at an Ecumenical Study Week in Geneva, April, 1943.

We must keep ourselves so open to the breath of the Spirit that we do not cling to outworn forms. Some of the old frameworks have gone already and others will follow. We must learn to discriminate in dealing with past traditions, between what is *essential* and what is of *secondary* importance. Let us find the line of division between the formal framework and the *values* which it enshrined and protected. In a time of crisis Christian discernment consists in unshaken support of what is essential with a readiness to throw all the rest overboard in a moment with joy and without regret.

A Norwegian woman student spoke recently of the amazing freedom enjoyed today by her fellow countrymen, because material possessions no longer count for anything, and they are ready to give up everything, even to life itself. Now it is in this freedom of those for whom nothing counts but God and His cause that we must take our stand today in thinking of the tasks of youth in the world of tomorrow. If we are led to talk of organisations we must remember that organisations are but instruments towards a goal that lies beyond them. That end is the glory of God and the establishment of His kingdom.

We have been hearing these days about the Church militant and its mission in the world. We have seen it engaged in a vast conflict against the forces of denial and of destruction which have been let loose over all the surface of the earth. Now we must find a place for the youth movements in this total effort of the Church militant.

There is no other problem that interests us so directly; for we are concerned no longer with the task of the Church in general, but with *our own particular* tasks, as Christian students, and that whether we are members of the S.C.M. or of some other organisation; whether we are already involved in action or are busy furnishing the weapons of the Spirit for those who must fight tomorrow. We must learn how to act, how to prepare ourselves in the most effective way. We must learn to what extent and in what manner the existing youth movements can help us. It is not to a discussion of theory that I call you today but to a collective examination of our consciences.

Looking backward to origins

First I wish to say a few words of history; it is as we seize a movement at its source, when it first wells forth that we best seize its essential vocation.

The nineteenth century was, on the plane of thought, the century of liberalism and of rationalism, the century of individualism; but it was also paradoxically, on the Christian level, the century of awakening, the century of mission, both within and without. It is characteristic of this century that, in the Protestant Church, this missionary work was in most cases due, not to the initiative of official churches taking action as such, but to private societies which arose out of revival movements or out of pietist groups. To be sure these movements had their birth in the Church, in the sense that they were created by believers, active members of some church or definite Christian group; but they did not depend upon it organically—hierarchically, if I may say so.

The youth movements did not escape this law. They were due to private initiative, and they often arose simultaneously, so quickly did they respond to the necessities of the moment. Their origins were closely bound to certain movements of revival, to British, American and German piety. It is a judgment of God on the churches of the nineteenth century that the most living communities, those most deeply infused with the apostolic spirit, were often established outside the framework of the official churches.

The Spirit bloweth where it listeth. The first great conference of American students convened under the name of International Bible School, was assembled at Mount Hermon in 1886 by Moody, the great evangelist; it is there that the Student Volunteer Missionary Movement was born, from whose impulse there was to arise a few years later the World's Student Christian Federation.

The origin of the great movements of youth which were later to bear the name of "ecumenical", explains certain of their characteristics:

1) Their first object was a *missionary* one: their watchword was "the Evangelisation of Youth by Youth". When in 1846 George Williams founded the first club which was to give rise to the Y.M.C.A., his aim was simply to win for Christ other young business men like himself. When John R. Mott had the vision of a movement of Christian students extending to all the universities of the world, his aim was to win the universities for Jesus Christ, to bind in one great fellowship the young Christian intellectuals of East and West and to raise in the colleges workers—pastors, missionaries and laymen for all forms of Christian missionary service.

2) The originality of this method was in its *vocational specialisation.* It was begun with the idea that our normal field of action and of missionary endeavour is our own chosen vocation. That was the principle of George Williams from the start; so was it of John Mott in planning the evangelisation of the university. So also was it the principle of the Y.W.C.A. of America when it developed the three main sections of its work, for girls in business and in the professions, for working-girls and for students. This division of work has its drawbacks from the point of view of unity within the movement, but it encourages a more closely integrated Christianity, and one more directly in relation to the problems of daily life. I think that perhaps the Christian Associations as a whole have not pushed this principle as far as they might or ought; Catholic Action has perhaps been more skilful than we have in fitting itself into the actual structure of society, with its sections for schools, rural areas and young workers.

I am well aware that the desire to broaden the field of action, to become all things to all men has in certain movements relegated to a secondary place the indirect evangelisation which was their original aim. They have sought to create a favourable setting for their work of education and preservation, and their methods have shown the influence of prevailing educational theory. They have become institutionalised—you all know the symbol of the famous equilateral triangle. On the other hand with us in Europe, the original dynamism has sometimes crystallised into a pious conservatism. In either case there has been a deviation from the original direction. The primary object of these independent youth movements is the evangelisation of youth by youth which takes as its main field of action the field of professional work.

The beginnings of ecumenism

3) There is a third characteristic to be added to these; the youth movements have been *interdenominational.* From the beginning the youth movements have been concerned to win souls for Jesus Christ and not for any particular denomination; they have systematically abstained from all denominational proselytism. Both in principle and in fact they have united young men and young women of all the Christian denominations, without special attachment to any of these. After some years of vacillation in which certain countries demanded that their active members should be members of an evangelical church,

there was adopted everywhere the principle of a declaration of personal faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord.

"Who are you to judge another's servant?" Whoever confesses Jesus Christ as Lord may belong to us. That is the basic principle which has at the same time marked the extension and the limitations of our movements. I say the limitations, for ecumenism is not syncretism; the youth movements are open to all seekers but they have a Lord whom they confess before the world. Every compromise, every backsliding on this point has proved fatal; for a missionary movement syncretism has in it the seeds of death. This syncretism has been a real temptation for certain of our movements which were striving for unity in action rather than in doctrine. It has always been necessary to re-emphasise the unique character of God's revelation in Jesus Christ, to bring back to the centre movements which were absorbed in the social task of the moment. On the other hand it has been equally necessary to remind of their social mission other movements which have been dangerously shut up in their ivory tower.

As for the interdenominational—or as I prefer to call it the "ecumenical"—character of our movements, it has suffered attack at many points these days. I am sure it is unjust to accuse our predecessors of ecclesiastical indifference, for they were individually good members of the church. But their categories of thought were different from those which today dominate in certain movements and certain theologies. The whole atmosphere of the nineteenth century was individualistic, the emphasis was laid primarily on personal conversion, and the unity men sought after was of the pious order; so that the ecclesiastical problem as such was not deliberately left on one side, only its urgency and complexity were not observed.

It took the twentieth century, with its doctrinal stiffening and its renewed sense of the Church and of the incarnation, for the ecumenical problem to rise sharply within the realm of thought, and in the very heart of our movements, and first of all in the W.S.C.F., to give rise to a tension both painful and fruitful. To that I must return later.

Now I wish to link this on to what has been said about the unity of the Church of Jesus Christ as a God-given unity, which we are powerless to create and which we are only asked to *manifest* in the concrete reality of history. As far as the manifestation of this unity is concerned, no one will dispute that the youth movements were indeed pioneers. They *lived* the reality of the

unity of those who are in Christ; they experienced in their movements, in their international conferences, a unity which cuts across all distinctions of races, of classes, of nationalities, of denominations. They tested the movement by their first empirical method of advance. It is not by chance that all, or almost all, the present leaders of the ecumenical movement came from their ranks.

These movements awoke in many men and women a sense of the vocation of the unity of the Church of Jesus Christ which nothing will ever root out of their heart and soul. I am convinced that they have been the chosen instrument of God to prepare the way for the World Council of Churches. The Church is our mother, but the World Council is our child! Although this does not wholly prevent the possibility that one day the child will outgrow and completely absorb his parents. But he is not yet in existence; so do not let us anticipate!

The Ability to pioneer

4) This leads me to a fourth characteristic of the youth movements. Because of their youth, because of their independence, they have done *pioneer* work. This is a fact, as I have just mentioned, in the interdenominational realm; it is no less true in the region of interracial and international relations. The first ecumenical conference held in the Far East was that of the W.S.C.F. in Tokyo in 1907; the first ecumenical conference in orthodox countries was held by the W.S.C.F. at Constantinople in 1911. For years now in the Far East the Western secretaries of our movements have thought it quite natural to work under the direction of their colleagues, although the missionary societies were later in recognising the necessity of this subordination. For years now our youth movements in the United States of America have fought valiantly against the principle of segregation of coloured people, and their white secretaries have worked on national committees on a footing of complete equality with their coloured colleagues.

International conferences and committees of our movements have raised the problems of Christian responsibility in social matters, no less than in international and interracial relations. We may smile at these magnificent "resolutions on paper"! They do not change the world. But if this labour pursued in common does not produce immediate fruits, it does contribute to the forming of men and women who look beyond the narrow frontiers of the traditions of their class and nation; of Christians who are

capable of making a more objective judgment on world events, and being responsible citizens. Some of these men and women will fill posts to-morrow in which their influence may work towards a new order of greater justice. Here too those "resolutions" made by our movements, however naïve they may seem to some people, have paved the way to conferences like that of Oxford, or to work such as is pursued today by the Study Department of the World Council of Churches. Here too the youth movements have been the advance guard of the church militant: shock troops, daring from their very nature, behind which the main forces of the ecclesiastical army engage slowly and cautiously in battle. It is the privilege of the youth movements to be able to advance easily and to live dangerously. We are examples of that today. In some occupied countries we have seen the youth movements take up their position openly, squarely facing all risks and perils on the Jewish question, long before the official church as such could decide to speak, and in a more radical way than the church has ever done.

There are some who would rebuke them for being free-lances, and who would like to draw them back into the ranks. Yet it is not a bad thing to have such troops. When they have made a breach, the regular army passes in on their heels; on the other hand, if their manoeuvres fail, they compromise nobody else. This is a priceless gain.

Facing a new situation

I have already referred to the fact that the twentieth century, with its revival of doctrines, its deepened sense of the incarnation, and of the church, its reaction in every realm against the liberalism and individualism of the nineteenth century, set the problem of ecumenism on a new plane. The youth movements have from this very fact had to turn to an examination of conscience, and on certain matters to revise their methods.

1) Side by side with them there have been growing up denominational groups of increasing power: church groups, in certain countries bound to each other quite loosely, but in others tending to organise themselves nationally and even internationally (Lutherans, Baptists, Methodists, etc.). The ecumenical youth movements, which have behind them either a century or a half-century of history, see their field of action daily invaded by new groups. What is their relationship to be?

It was only natural that the W.S.C.F. should be the first to see this problem and face it boldly. Its ecumenical position was

after 1925 and during the following years, the subject of much discussion. The Federation declared itself ready to accept within its fold denominational groups, provided that they were not exclusive but would admit other groups beside them. The first impetus in this direction was given by Russian and Balkan Orthodox groups, whose liturgical and doctrinal traditions were a stumbling-block to our Protestant individualism. They emphasised the fact that their relation to the total community could only be collective; that unless they lived out their Christianity within the Church, it would lose its full meaning and its intrinsic value. But at the same time in Protestant circles the need of being more firmly rooted in a tradition was beginning to be felt.

Ecumenism is not a colourless undenominationalism, a kind of ecclesiastical cosmopolitanism; it is rather a collaboration among people who know where they derive from and what they want. In other words the W.S.C.F. came to assert more and more clearly that firm denominational convictions are the necessary basis for all true ecumenical work.

This principle once admitted, the W.S.C.F. found itself approached by various Protestant movements which until then had kept themselves apart. In the United States, where these denominational movements are numerous, this new policy may have great consequences.

2) In 1939 the World Conference of Christian Youth at Amsterdam marks a decisive step in the co-operation of Youth Movements. It was composed half of representatives of the independent (ecumenical) youth movements, and half of the representatives of church youth groups. The morning worship was celebrated each day according to the tradition of a definite Church—a revolutionary measure which not even the Oxford Conference had dared to evisage. This date marks a stage in the history of our movements. We now see the denominational movements gradually awakening to an ecumenical sense, becoming conscious of their membership in the Universal Church. On the other hand we see the members of our independent youth movements awakening to the necessity of striking root more firmly in the visible Church and of offering that Church their service.

3) The facts which I have just mentioned are the manifestation of a new state of mind; of a new attitude of the Church to youth and of youth to the Church.

The theological revival which began on the Continent of Europe some twenty years ago led the Church to have a more

complete and more organic vision of its mission, and in particular of its teaching mission. While the totalitarian regimes devoted the best of their efforts to the capturing of youth, the churches saw their young people in danger and felt compelled in a wholly new way to keep them, to instruct and guide them.

The new attitude of Youth to the Church

Young people responded with enthusiasm to this call from the Church. The greater the chaos in people's minds, the more was the absence of coherent teaching apparent. And who outside the Church could offer it? Further, from the very day the Church was attacked and threatened, the very day it became a *confessing* and militant Church, young people instinctively understood that it was the real bastion of spiritual resistance, and that with it remained the one hope not only for the other world but for this world. In the vast struggle which ensued against pagan ideologies, the youth movements were in the advance positions which might at any moment be swept by the enemies' fire. In fact in certain countries they were suppressed. The Church as established remained the impregnable fortress on which instinctively men fell back in time of danger.

In Holland and France, in particular, we have seen the Christian youth movements coming together and forming a "bloc" with the Church, partly from necessity, no doubt, but also, we must emphasise it, out of a deep conviction. Is this merely a temporary situation, as some people think? or at least a situation which is, from force of circumstances, strictly European, and due to war and occupation? Some of my colleagues on other continents feel that it is, and see with uneasiness and surprise certain countries questioning the organisation of our independent movements. From more than one quarter new and violent outbreaks of anticlericalism are predicted for after the war. I am no prophet. It may be that we are in the presence of complex currents and cross currents. In some countries the Church will emerge from this war strengthened by its trials and by the inflexible resistance it has shown. But in others it may be left in some way weakened and discredited. Yet in the midst of the confusion many young people have understood that the Church was their mother and that, loyal or disloyal, they cannot disassociate themselves from her. Something in their relations to the Church has from henceforward been profoundly altered.

We are not talking here of a question of organisation. We know now that we are *in* the Church; that we can only think, work, witness *in* the Church, because the Church, in the midst of a pagan world which encompasses us on every side, is the one place where Jesus Christ is believed in, is preached and obeyed. If we wish to continue the combat of the faith in the world and against the world, it is only from the Church that we may expect directions and watchwords; there is no possibility of their coming from elsewhere except at the cost of complete anarchy—and we are tired of anarchy.

Is it then enough that the members of our movements should be rooted in the living tradition of their Church, or must these movements themselves come under the control of the Church? That question is now being thrashed out in France and Holland. The question would be a simple one if the Church were one; but it is divided. And so the union of youth has the value of a symbol, a prophetic character whose range we must not underestimate. Another question arises: whether these denominational groups would have the same missionary impulse as the independent movements. In theory the Church ought not to delegate its missionary vocation to any other organisation, for that vocation is of its very essence. In fact, both in the domain of youth movements and elsewhere, it is not in the official framework of the Church that the missionary movement was born.

The situation may change, in so far as the Church once more becomes the Church—in the full sense of the term—and in so far as co-operation between the churches becomes a concrete reality. But in some countries there is a mistrust of everything that has clerical flavour or the appearance of denominational proselytism. Here again we must pay close attention to national situations, observe elasticity in formulas, and leave the necessary liberty of movement to these advancing wings of the Church.

Our vocation is clear

Here I approach the most burning problem of the after war period. There will be appalling gaps in the entire generation of young people between the ages of 18 and 40. The younger generation as it comes on will have no elders. As in France and Germany (and elsewhere) after 1918 it will have no one to guide it but older men and tired men. There will be a complete gulf between the generations that cannot be bridged. On the other hand, those who return will have passed through such

experiences, and the children who have grown up in an atmosphere of war and of occupation will have had so disturbed an adolescence, and will have been so robbed of all illusions, that a Christianity which is not rooted in reality, will be intolerable to them. They will have demands to make which will at the same time make us rejoice and tremble. As far as Europe is concerned, I am thinking not only of the young Russians and the young Germans who have been through the hell of war, but of the millions of prisoners and forced labourers at the moment in Germany, and those other millions who have been harried or concealed or deported. In what state physically, psychologically or spiritually, will they return to us? Have our youth movements any message for them? A message that is real, that has been lived out, that is authentic enough for them to listen to? Once all the human ideologies are proved to be no more than balloons that have burst, once our young people face emptiness with despair in their hearts, will our movements be able to approach them? This is the only real question for Europe, or for our comrades in the Far East, or in Africa or Australasia, who are also at this moment pouring out their blood and watching the breaking down of the old framework.

It is the youth of the whole world, which war today is decimating and revolution is wearing down. And this youth is the Church of to-morrow.

What must we do then? We must work, first of all, to build up our local groups on a solid foundation, to establish communities of work and prayer for training the workers of to-morrow which both Church and world will require.

In times of crisis it is essential to multiply living cells which may transmit life to future generations even although all outer frameworks collapse in ruins. And this means careful co-ordination on the regional and local plane, and the *intensive training of young leaders,* of what I shall call *replacement units.* This is the new direction which our youth movements in the occupied countries have taken. This is why their chief effort has been brought to bear upon teaching the Bible, for the one weapon we have against all the forces which tend to divide our movements is the Sword of the Word of God. This Word has come to life in an extraordinary fashion at a time when all the words in our language were in the process of losing their meaning. But at that very moment our movements, in the full flood of revolution, were relearning what I call the *necessity of incarnation.*

We have suffered in our churches, in our movements, and perhaps more than elsewhere, in our S.C.M. from a disembodied Christianity. I mean by that a Christianity which had no real grip upon reality, which remained a stranger to the interests of the man in the street, of the peasant in the fields, of the worker in the factory, of the student in library or laboratory. But God revealed Himself by incarnation in the life of man, and one of the Bible's most striking characteristics is its realism. The message of the Bible is always addressed to the concrete man. The youth movements were right in wishing to catch man, the whole man, in the concrete situation of his work; it is there that he must be sought, there he must be helped to live as a Christian the daily reality of his existence, the reality of his home, of his profession and community. Theoretically we know all this, but practically we have nearly everything to learn. When one belongs, as I do, to a country which is largely Catholic or free-thinking, one is struck, and sometimes driven to despair, by noticing how the Protestant has a special jargon of his own, which is almost incomprehensible to other people, a mentality of his own, a whole circle of relationships. How difficult it is for him to be merely a man among men, truly a Christian and truly a man. Since the crisis our national movements have been acquiring some idea of what it means to be a *member of a community;* the community of the village, of the high school or university, of the youth training camp or of the nation. I am convinced that this is the experience, in some degree or other, of all the countries which are at war; of the others too in so far as mobilisation stirs up the different strata of Society.

This then is the primary task to which we must harness our energies, the building up of living cells of Christians, to be centers of radiation in the mass of the nation. I believe that if we so harness ourselves, all the rest will be added to us. Schemes of organisation, old or new, will come in their own good time.

The mission of the W.S.C.F. today

I wish in conclusion to speak more specifically of our task as students. As I have said before the task that is set us lies in the universities themselves. The time we spend there is short and we must use it profitably. No one else can offer the witness we can offer in the university. I know that there are many other tasks today which clamour for the student's attention: church groups, scout troops and the rest. But whatever these tasks out-

side the university may be, however legitimate in themselves, it is within the university that we pass our days. This therefore is our primary field of action.

Now this is not a question of recruiting members for the S.C.M. or for any other organisation. It is rather a plea for thinking first of all as Christians of our task as students; for asking ourselves what is the direction of our studies, of our search for truth. It is a plea for thinking about this university of which we are now an integral part, for taking our place consciously in its collective mission; and if it is unconscious of any mission, for working to make it clear, not by any criticism of the curriculum—which would be an academic gesture—but by forming in each faculty work-teams to restore a true direction to all our work.

In all our movements there has been latterly a marked return to the Bible. This is particularly true of the S.C.M. But we are often content to turn our Bible study into pious little groups for nourishing the inner life. Students must do much more than that. They must learn to think in a biblical way; I mean to consider all the problems of thought and conduct which face them in their professional life in the light of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ and the coming of His kingdom. This then is the revolution which the Church must achieve if it is to be truly incarnate in the world around it. And we must have our tiny part in the revolution. We must react against the dichotomy which tends to separate professional from private life for the lawyer, the doctor, the artist or the scholar. There are technical processes to be sure, but there is no science or law which is autonomous. There is a creation of God with laws which He has fixed, there is a will of God for human societies, a will which must be apprehended and interpreted concretely at each moment. A great task awaits us; for we must re-examine the foundations of all our thought and of all our action. This is the first task our times exact of us. And this is our specific calling as Christian students. But this task on which I insist must be pursued *together*. So, in establishing work-teams, we shall restore a sense of community to the university.

We must build communities of work and prayer, with an element of research and of teaching, where spiritual, theological and practical training can be acquired. Perhaps the English contributor to The Student World was right in saying that a certain type of study group is a relic of an outworn liberalism

and individualism. But we have no desire to substitute a rule of authority, a sort of *ex cathedra* instruction added to other *ex cathedra* instruction. We want team-work, directed it is true, but really team-work, pursued systematically and with a clear idea of the end it is aiming at.

The time is past for casual group meetings, with no aim but the meeting; when motley programmes were constructed, Bible study alternated with social and literary study, and there was no organic link between the different activities. We shall of course continue our literary or social study, but with the concrete aim of understanding our times, and of taking our place as Christians and as men who have to live among other men. That will help us to come to grips with reality.

Now all this labour of thought, if it is serious, can only be carried out inside the Church. I mean that we cannot set ourselves to build up from nothing our own little theory of knowledge. It must all be founded upon the Bible, integrated in the living tradition of the Church which is ours, tested by its confession of faith and its living thought.

Perhaps it will be hard at first, for the Church is beginning to rethink for itself certain of the great problems which meet it today on every plane of life. There are many of these problems on which the Church has as yet no clear word to give us. But who knows? some of its future thinkers and teachers may come out of our ranks!

Some of you may think I have spoken too much of the intellectual mission of the Christian student. We are witnessing today a revaluation of culture, and of the intelligence which is forcing us to bring out once more into the light of day the true value of intelligence, which is to glorify God. To every man his trade. The student's trade is to study; it is above all by his manner of studying that he is called to glorify God.

I am not forgetting, while I say this, the ordinary Christian witness as between friend and friend, that miraculous grace of friendship which binds together those who see one vision of the task before them. That is the daily experience of our movements, that is their strength and their joy. But such experiences are lived, not told. Countless young people have found in our movements what a Christian community means and by that discovery their lives have been transformed. Brotherhood like this is rare in other places, we must admit, and leaves a nostalgia in some hearts which follows them through life.

Tasks in Church and University

There are further aspects of our task to be mentioned. Recent experiences, and notably in the occupied countries, show that side by side with its mission to the university a Student Movement has also a responsibility to other youth movements. The war and the occupation have drawn movements together; in France we have seen joint "camps" multiplying—camps for training leaders, for Bible study, for missionary interest. A whole work of education is in progress, with students quite naturally as the trainers. The closer the connection of a movement with the Church, the more fully does this aspect of its task develop. The result is sometimes a kind of tension between these two poles of activity, the university and the Church. These hours of crisis are showing us our particular duty as an active factor in the life of the university, Church and country. These are the three facets of one witness.

But let us keep our university function in the front rank. It is only if we take it seriously that we can give truly effective service to the Church by providing it with the lay workers it requires. That is our essential vocation, which God sets before us in placing us in the university.

In conclusion—in these days of conference we have tried to give a total vision of the Church of God in its eternal vocation no less than in its concrete existence; a total vision of the world in which this Church is working. Once we belong to these youth movements we can no longer isolate East from West. We European Christians are often in danger of a *European isolationism,* and it is now more than ever necessary to look beyond our frontiers and beyond the oceans. How strange it is that this sense of the world seems to have awakened or been strengthened in the occupied countries, while it is weaker in those where normal life continues.

. . . . . .

It is you in the countries which have been spared the worst horrors of war, who must face the future boldly. It is not too early to prepare. It is as you begin to realise the judgment which is today being worked out on the world and on the Church, and the appeal which this judgment makes, that you will understand what both judgment and appeal mean for *you* in *your* situation. And so, by applying ourselves to the concrete tasks of today, we may be preparing for to-morrow.

Thinking Ahead as Christians

KENILWORTH[1]

The report of a consultative W.S.C.F. meeting held in London, 6th to 8th February, 1943

1. *Christians Taking a Stand.*

Today in many countries the real issues are sharper than ever before and Christians who might otherwise have drifted are compelled to take a stand. The Christian takes his stand even when he can entertain no temporal hope; success is not his criterion but the Will of God. He bases his action on no abstract principle nor on a vision of his own and his nation's temporal future, but on a call of God; this call is immediate and relates to the present. God interrogates us through events. Prudential considerations may lead us to what its advocates euphemistically call "political realism": but response to God's call issues in concrete spiritual decision. Political realism claims to recognise facts and promises success; obedience to God involves death but thereafter resurrection. Only those who have experienced Good Friday are qualified to rebuild.

Not merely when under obvious pressure should a Christian take his stand; he must be watchful and able to discern the signs of the times. He must see where in his situation the real issue between the world and his faith lies. Here one may distinguish between three different situations: (1) Where the Christian's spiritual resistance is closely identified with the national resistance, e.g., France, Holland and Norway; (2) Where it is not so identified and where the Church fights its battle alone, e.g., Russia and Germany; (3) Where it is not plainly evident what forces are to be resisted in the name of Christ, e.g., Britain, W. Africa.

Christians, because of their unity in Christ can enter into one another's experiences. No group must boast itself because of its different situation (e.g., its having suffered more). All must endeavour humbly to learn from one another.

As individual Christians take a stand, so too must the Church. In social matters some of us believe that the sole function of the Church is to speak negatively—that is by way of condemnation of, e.g., Anti-Semitism and State Absolutism—this negative function does in fact involve the Christian in positive action. Others are of the opinion that the Church is not thus limited in its attitude to social and political questions and that it has a positive function to perform.

[1] The name of the hotel where it took place seemed to be the most picturesque title to attach to this meeting! Ed.

Whether it be positive or negative, we note the fact that when the Church does speak, it does so as often as not under pressure from the common people. Creed and Faith are not the same and the Christian may find himself lining up with the inarticulately faithful rather than with those who are theologically vocal.

Questions

What bearing has the experience of Christians in occupied countries upon the situation of other Christians? What should be the special witness of Christians in countries not overrun by an enemy? Must Christian thinking about the State, war, etc., be in terms of judgment only, or has the gospel of redemption a social and this-worldly as well as a personal and other-worldly significance? How do we differentiate between the Will of God and our own personal inclinations?

2. Moral Priorities

We were fortunate in having with us one who had played a part in the French resistance movement. He opened for us, as it were, a trap door into the life of occupied Europe and much of what he told us coloured our subsequent discussion.

In a situation where there is no temporal hope the Christian takes his stand at the summons of a Divine word. This stand involves resistance. But resistance of what kind? There are two kinds—armed resistance and spiritual resistance. We note that the first may often involve the second, but the second does not necessarily involve the first. Both types of resistance raise serious moral problems.

Armed resistance involves premeditated breaches not only of the law of the land (e.g., black market, false passports, etc.) but also of the personal moral code (e.g., telling lies). All of us viewed this development with much misgiving while noting that to tell a lie did not necessarily imply a lack of regard for Truth or to deal on the black market a disregard for Justice; the lie in the soul was more important than the spoken lie; loyalty, we saw, was here given to a community within and opposed to the state, and this loyalty was seen as possessing overriding claims. Nevertheless there was a danger that such acts might come to be regarded lightly and end by destroying the very basis which they were intended to preserve. If this were to be avoided, a costly tension would have to be preserved; their proper price was a permanently uneasy conscience. Some of our non-European members at this point sharply questioned the legitimacy of generalising the methods used by resistance movements. If France might have a moral holiday why not India and West Africa? Was not the sanctioning of immoral acts even in the name of a higher principle the negation of Christianity? It was claimed that such acts

led to a deeper morality but might they not also lead to continued and widespread immorality, particularly amongst children? In the life of a real Christian was there any legitimate place for compromise?

Spiritual resistance issuing in passive resistance and non-cooperation was seen by some as the right alternative, but it was recognised that this too involved grave moral problems; nevertheless it did seem to some to be more in line with what we might expect the early Christians would have done in similar circumstances. It did not promise success, but it did prevent moral standards from being corrupted.

The problems here raised, though most evident in occupied countries, were very real elsewhere; indeed, it was a question of degree for even when the Government was good, society was not. There were therefore always things to be resisted in the name of Christ for those who had eyes to see.

Questions: What is the relation between ethical ideals (e.g., justice, truth) and legal enactments or patterns of moral behaviour? Are there moral priorities? What are the limiting factors in determining what is permissible for a Christian to do in defence of his State, Nation, Family or life? What is the relevance to our problem of Paul's treatment of law in Galatians? Is the Christian bound absolutely by any specific law, (i.e., by any rule which concerns itself only with certain actions as distinct from the motives lying behind them)?

3. *Biblical authority and political action*

A large part of our discussion took its departure from an attempt to understand the present implication of John 17: 15 and 16, being in the world but not of it. We did not however, proceed by way of close biblical exegesis and this fact was commented upon at a later stage in our meeting.

By contrast we noted the way in which the Présinge findings related themselves closely to scriptural authority; that our discussions have not been thus consciously related is, we believe, due to two causes. In the first place the time at our disposal was very short; we therefore tended to assume the biblical background and concentrate upon matters where difference of opinion was more likely to be clearly in evidence. We were, however, conscious of the fact that where real differences disclosed themselves, these were rooted in differences in the realm of theology. In the second place we noted that the atmosphere of the country in which a discussion takes place is apt to influence even an international group and in Britain it is probably true that for geographical reasons the process of disintegration so evident on the continent has not gone so far. There is therefore less sense of a need for localising Christian authority, since that authority is here articulated in society albeit in a very diffused

manner. In considering the question of authority the Christian must give due weight to the voice of the Church and to the implications of Christian history.

Questions: How can the new method of Bible-study (e.g., as at Bièvres Conference in 1937) be pursued without giving the impression of biblical literalism? How may we avoid importing our views into the Bible and finding there only what we desire to find?

4. *Justice and Hatred*

In Europe today there is a hunger for Justice; this is especially true amongst those who have personal experience of the evil forces at work. It is of the utmost importance that these forces should be positively and publicly defeated and to that end the Christian must be ready to sacrifice himself. Justice must be clearly vindicated; only this will prevent the kind of miasmal moral confusion that followed the Munich Conference in 1938. The common man must have assurance that there is something steady behind the disorder in the world; this desire is natural and right and justifies the punishment of responsible offenders. Justice must be embodied in action.

We realise the difficulties inherent in the above statement. It is all too easy for man to forget that the justice dispensed by him is relative and not absolute. It is all too easy under the guise of justice to give way to hatred and revenge. We are warned "Never revenge yourselves but let the Wrath of God have its way" (Romans 12: 19). At this point a difference showed itself amongst us. Some were of the opinion that the Christian as such has no concern with retribution or penal justice; this rests with God; the Christian's task is to save the offender and this cannot be achieved by punishment but only by redemptive love. The State, it is true, must punish offenders, but it should do so only as a social necessity and not identify its action in so doing with a vindication of Divine Justice. The punishment after the war of certain offenders would be necessary so as to prevent widespread private vengeance. There were others who thought that while human justice was never entirely impartial and free from mistakes, yet there was more in it than social necessity, else why did we speak of "deserts" and believe that it was wrong to punish the innocent? It was necessary to teach people not only that aggression *did not pay,* but also that it was *wrong.*

It was seen that hatred was a problem that must be frankly faced; in some parts of Europe it had grown to fever pitch. Indifference is worse than hate; indeed, we do not hate enough, but the question is *what* you do well to hate. Does not justice require a strong emotion as its basis and is not this emotion a real hatred of injustice? But can you hate evil things and yet avoid hating the people who do them? On the socio-political plane perhaps there is no positive answer to this question.

We touched on the problem of the re-education of Nazi Youth and it seemed to us that the Christian had a duty both to the aggressor and to the victim; neither must be overlooked. Germany should be put in a position in which she can be self-reformed; this could only be achieved by combining firmness with love.

Questions: Is human justice derived from divine justice or from political expediency? How can a Christian avoid identifying his hatred of things with the people who do them?

5. *Repentance and Reconciliation.*

Reconciliation after the war will be difficult because it must proceed from some common basis and from the recognition of certain facts, but propaganda and passion have distorted the facts and both sides are likely to claim that justice is all on their side. Furthermore, reconciliation implies some common standard of values; this too will be largely lacking. The problem becomes most acute when the reconciliation is between people within the same nation; collaborationists do not speak the same language as their loyal fellow countrymen; they have a different standard of values and in their eyes success justifies everything.

The only common basis from which we as Christians can start is our solidarity with others in sin. This common ground is more likely to lead to reconciliation than a common ground constructed by each side trying to justify itself. We speak of Repentance, but Repentance must not remain simply a theological or religious idea; it must be translated into economic terms. Certain tangible barriers have first to be removed before political reconciliation can make progress.

Questions: Can political reconciliation best be promoted by a discussion of Facts or by a discussion of Values? What does Repentance mean when translated into political and economic terms?

6. *International Civil War*

This is a war against two things: Axis domination and all forms of totalitarianism. The last national war was the war of 1914-18; but this is an international civil war, though it has of course certain nationalistic features (e.g., we each fight in national uniforms). In Europe this fact is clear, though it is not so obvious in the Far East.

If this war is a civil war, then it follows that we must fight it in our own country and that means action here and now. Students, however, need to be warned that for them action is not equivalent to activism. God is acting too, but we shall not notice what He is doing, unless we know what He is like, unless we study His Word and listen to His voice; we must also be alive and informed in matters of fact. The biblical answer to the question, "What shall I *do*?" is "Believe"; our first task is evangelism and that must be followed by a consciousness of our collective responsibilities.

Christian students have throughout found it difficult to see how they fitted into the war. Pacifism had made some feel completely outside it, but even non-pacifists could work up little enthusiasm in pulling things down. War reveals the tragedy of our human situation and so involves a sense of frustration, nevertheless it should be viewed as a necessary task.

If this war is a civil war, why was not this seen in the Federation long ago? Why was it only a few socialists who left their own country to fight in Spain? Has our Federation thinking been just an easy way of avoiding an awkward decision? How is it that many students come to no decision but passively await the call-up? These are questions that W.S.C.F. members would do well to face.

Questions: Is this in some senses a religious war? If so, what is the relation between the stand made by Christians (e.g., German Confessional Church struggle) and the stand made by the political anti-totalitarians (e.g., International Brigade in Spain)? What is the significance of the central position now held by the Church in the national life of some countries (e.g., Holland)?

7. Russia

Our discussion on Russia covered a wide field and we will not attempt to summarise it here. All we can do is to pick out some points which we believe should be carefully pondered.

a) *The Treatment of Christianity*

No one can deny the terrible persecutions that have taken place; this was followed by a Government policy of gradual suffocation; both have failed to kill the Church. Whether the limited freedom now granted is due to a change of heart or a change of tactics it is too early to say. A permanent change of policy on the part of the authorities should not be ruled out. Much may depend upon world opinion.

b) *The Social Order*

We must not overlook the great achievements of the U.S.S.R. Their social order is integral and provides a high level of security. To gain this the freedom of the individual has been sacrificed perhaps to some extent rightly. What people are seeking today is not so much individual rights as *human* freedom.

c) *Existence of Christianity*

We must remember that Christianity is very far from being dead in Russia. It is estimated that two thirds of the population are still Christian. They have no contact with the outside world, but if contact can be renewed, we shall need to listen carefully to what they say.

d) *The People*

We must not forget to draw a distinction between the Soviet Government and the Russian people; we cannot reject the latter because we disagree with the former. We must seek to know them and refuse to permit the old isolation. Better knowledge will lead to fuller understanding and stronger solidarity.

e) *Communism and Russia*

The international civil war cuts across Russia too; if not why were political commissars stationed in the Red Army? It is still difficult to know whether the word Russia stands primarily for a Nation or a Creed. If it stands for a creed there is likelihood of conflict between social democracy and communism.

Today Russia is an enigma, but we must never forget that students in Russia were once within the W.S.C.F. They are still in our parish. We must be ready for them to enter again into the life of the W.S.C.F. Today co-operation with Russia is simply on the basis of political realities; this may yet develop into something more durable.

Questions: On what criteria and facts may we judge whether Soviet policy to Christianity is undergoing a permanent change? For the Christian which is more important, freedom or social security? Is Russian atheism nearer to Christianity than the paganism of those who believe in God, but use Him in their service?

8. *Nations and Continents*

We observed that the W.S.C.F. is organisationally built not on a Church basis, but on a national basis, and most of our discussion centred around the idea of the Nation; but we saw that there was a need today to think in global terms; this was especially true in regard to economics. Cultural nationalism had to be combined with economic internationalism. This was easy to say, but difficult to achieve, because (vide Marx) culture and economics were closely related.

To organise the world as a whole might immediately be impossible; it would be necessary to begin with continents. We saw a real danger in an Anglo-U.S.A. attempt to police the world. The creation of such a block would create other opposing blocks, especially in Asia. Nevertheless, the Christian must recognise the element of power in all political relationships. In any attempt to secure national independence the criterion must be the good of the whole.

Questions: For a Christian has the nation a positive value? Has a nation, like an individual, a particular calling?

9. *The Future of the Liberal University*

We gave some time to the whole question of post-war reconstruction and towards the end of our discussion concentrated on the

kind of university we would like to see. On this subject there was difference of opinion and so it may be best to indicate the line of our thinking by questions rather than statements. Are we out to rebuild the liberal university with Christians inside it? Has the liberal university any idea of what it stands for? Should we not contemplate having a Christian centre in every university and supplying through the curriculum definite Christian teaching? If this is done, how do you escape the danger of compulsory Christianity? How can you combine the voluntary element with universal Christian teaching? If the Christians close their ranks is there not a danger of segregation? Has not India something to teach us here with the fine record of its Christian colleges? These colleges are Christian in the sense that the staff is Christian, the large majority of students are not. The danger lies in appointing a man to the staff because he is a Christian and not because he is an expert in his subject. However, Christians are not likely to have a free hand, for Governments are now aware of the importance of higher education and our problem may be, not the liberal university, but the governmental ideological university.

This discussion led us to the question—Is it our primary job to concentrate on general student relief (albeit with some of our own members carrying it out) or on specifically Christian work, e.g., evangelism and the rebuilding of S.C.M.s? Ought movements in countries outside the war zone to raise money for the W.S.C.F. *or* for World Student Relief? Our answer was for both, but our first duty was to see that the W.S.C.F. had the funds it required. There would be a famine of faith as well as a physical and intellectual famine. Our job was to make sure that the *first* need was met though we recognised that often this could best be done through co-operation in the total service of others.

Questions: see above.

Poughkeepsie II

An open letter from a Vice-Chairman to a Secretary of the W.S.C.F.

Dear Suzanne,

The very first report upon arrival in the Toronto office is to you about the second Poughkeepsie—a report which is now long overdue.

After the first Poughkeepsie, the officers asked the British and United States movements if they would plan a few meetings with foreign students who happened to be in each country during the war, as you had evidently done to good advantage in 1914-1918. This was the way the second Poughkeepsie meeting really began. Then it seemed simpler to shift over from the Provisional Council of the

W.S.C.F. in the U.S.A. to the Federation office in Toronto. It was then that the Canadian S.C.M. joined in with their usual vigor and enthusiasm for Federation events and helped with the program and the delegates. So when we convened at Poughkeepsie, we were really a Federation gathering.

Robert Mackie had brought back with him from England the report of the Kenilworth meetings. Maybe it was so impressive that it discouraged us from trying to live up to it! Anyway, there is no official report of Poughkeepsie II. As the convener of the meeting, I have a guilty conscience—like the person who breaks the sequence of a round robin letter—that we did not plan for the preparation of any document.

In spite of having little tangible proof to show for it, the meeting had a sense of life and lift to it—something corporate that lives on in the same indescribable way as the Amsterdam Conference. One reason for this was the well-timed return of Robert Mackie, which gave us the advantage of the first hand contacts with the British and Swedish S.C.M.s as well as the link through André de Blonay with you and the Chairman of the Federation! What a continuous cause for gratitude that we have been able all through these years to keep this kind of close touch with each other!

An Easter meeting

Another reason was the fact that we were meeting at Easter-time. There were some who were indignant that we should have chosen that particular date. But for others, it meant coming to meet with the nearest they have to a family just now. We were the Christian family which one of our German members affectionately calls the *Oikoumene,* celebrating Good Friday and Easter together. From the course of our "confused as well as hard and honest thinking", our minds had been stretched around the world. In contrast to the unity which we felt as fellow Christians, we had seen the terrifying forces which are driving us apart. One of the Canadians headed his report of the conference: "One World—Is Oneness Possible?" and pointed out the misunderstandings between races, between Occident and Orient, between colonial peoples and their masters, between Bolshevism and Capitalism, and even between groups of Christians themselves in contrast to the oneness which is the birthright of all human beings. I think we all felt our own incompetence as Christians, and the Cross of Good Friday spoke to our condition. In our meditation that noon, Robert Mackie shared with us experiences from his visit to Europe. We saw through his eyes the flaming tanker in his convoy which kept steadily on its course because some engineer on board was willing to pay the price of his life to keep the engines going and so enable the others to be saved. We

saw the meaning of sacrificial love as it was on the first Good Friday, as it is today, and as it always will be if we accept its claims upon us.

Easter morning there was an early service on a hill top, a very simple, spontaneous service arranged by the Vassar undergraduates. With the dew still fresh on the grass in the early morning sun, Robert Mackie took our thoughts to other hill tops in North Africa where flowers were also blooming, but men were engaged in killing one another. Easter joy is of its own special kind. As a German soldier wrote about the other season of joy for Christians—Christmas:

"I wish you a Christmas festival full of joy and peace. That may seem a strange wish in such a time when there is no joy and peace. But what other source of real joy and inner peace has been left to us than this one fact that God lives and that He loves His humanity, His mankind which is torturing itself in error and sin? It is here on the front we learn to base all our life on this last and greatest joy that everything that may happen is in God's hands and that He still loves us. In former times we were happy at Christmas because we could create joy for others or receive some love from them and have a good time. This has all gone now, but there is revealed in its highest clarity the essential fact of an inexhaustible source of strength and power. . . ."

Later Easter morning Luther Tucker officiated for us in an Easter Communion Service—a simplified Anglican form. We were caught up together for one brief moment in the secret mystery of our corporate life—children of the same Father—from all parts of the earth—sensing through failures and sufferings the only joy in which we could all share—the joy of our Risen Lord.

Who came

We were a very fair representative gathering. There were members from the following countries:

Africa, South	Columbia	India
Africa, West	Czechoslovakia	Japan
Australia	Denmark	Peru
Belgium	Egypt	Russia
Bulgaria	France	Thailand
Canada	Germany	U.S.A.
China	Great Britain	

Actually this gives a false impression, because there were so few from each and such a big bloc from Canada and the United States. The Europeans were varied in their degree of knowledge of Student Christian Movements in their own countries. Some were old time leaders, and others hardly knew a movement was in existence. One of them was worried lest we ask her to organise a movement on her

return, which she felt would hardly be possible! Some were planning to stay on in America, others to return as soon as possible. The African group seemed of special value to the Federation as we look to development of student work on the west coast. One of the two South Americans was about to return to his country, and was eager for all the help we could give him on ecumenical relationships and the building of student programs. The Indians faced us up to the frustrations in which they live because of the political situation and to the role of Christian missionaries. The Chinese influenced our thinking a great deal out of their longer years of war experience and national reconstruction. We had a glimpse of some of the difficulties with which Japanese Christians are struggling. The American member from Thailand told us how he knew the little student Christian community in Bangkok was still intact by hearing them sing carols over the radio at Christmas-time! But between the fringes of the South, East and West there was the great lump of North Americans: solid, a bit complacent in its freedom from bombing, scorched earth and occupation—and a little ponderous in weighting the discussions according to its own ways of thought!

We're here, too

Just when North America became too dominating, the voice of China would remind us sharply that the solution of the world's problems could not be found in Europe or North America alone, the radio and press to the contrary notwithstanding! C. S. Tsai, who put the plea to us most strongly, was not asking for more or for special attention for China, but trying to make us see that the great unsolved issues of colonial peoples, and racial groups, and economic systems can only be dealt with effectively if the peoples concerned are fully included! In our own life within the Federation, quite as much as in wider international relationships, we must take care to keep the balance both in war relief and in post-war work! Any failures on the part of the Federation will never result from lack of having this called to our attention!

Tsai spoke from the heart to the movements still able to be engrossed in the world of ideas. He contrasted his own Student Christian Movement as a "Martha" in relation to the "Mary" movements. He felt that the "Maries", who weren't in the thick of things, came to look at life through coloured glasses; they became a little unrealistic. The Chinese S.C.M. would like some theologians to visit them, because they need help at this point, but he added "China would do the theologians a whale of good in the process!"

What about Russia?

We plunged into this question headlong, when one of the Russian members told about meeting Soviet sailors in port. "We speak the

same language, but we are strangers, we live in different worlds." And he asked, "What is the Federation going to do about Russia?" We didn't know what we were going to do about Russia. We saw many difficulties: 1) Within the Federation we saw there are those who say "stay away and have nothing to do with them", and those who say "co-operate at all costs—it's the only hope". No Federation meeting has been possible as between these two groups, and our decisions will have to be worked out later around very concrete actions. 2) There is the conviction of the Russians themselves that they are on so much higher a level of social revolution that contacts with those on lower levels are harmful. 3) We are already under severe judgment by Russians. They ask the question: "Where were you Christians in Spain, in Abyssinia? What part did your Churches play?" And they will point to the general ineffectiveness of the Churches in matters of social injustice. 4) There is the difference between the Christian and the materialist's view of the universe. Since the latter believe everything stems from matter rather than from God, all their social judgments are influenced accordingly. Christians insist on relating moral things to God; Communists deal with each issue on its own particular merits.

Question: Then how does the Russian judge the merits of each issue?

Answer: His judgment is limited to mankind en masse—in the collective. This is the only kind of criterion he acknowledges.

Question: But if Christians show that their religion results in good social action, won't Russians be convinced?

Answer: No, because they separate religion completely from social action.

We didn't follow through to a conclusion. But if there had been a summary, it would have run something like this:—

The Federation claims Russian members. They have been a part of us for a long while, and they will continue in our fellowship. We recognise our continuing obligations to them, and these will change as the circumstances of our members may change. We have included Russian students in internment camps, and students of the University of Kharkov in the World Student Relief work. We will continue to meet the needs of students, *all* students, as they become known to us. We believe in the importance of two-way traffic in ideas. We wish to tell them and we wish to learn from them. Members of the Federation must become more "literate" politically, we must be able to deal more effectively with divergent groups in political action. Above all, we must know our own Christian faith, know it in such a way that we will never lose it under the impact of powerful non-Christian ideologies.

What is the Christian Faith?

Professor Hromadka of Prague helped us in the opening period. He characterised the Church as the divine agent in the world engaged in a struggle against the world itself. Yet a Church, which has never lost the equally strong call to take responsibility for the world, here and now. Because the Crucified and Risen Lord is the Lord of the whole world, the Church carries responsibility for His rule. Every secular civilisation must reflect the majesty of God. So the Church sends her people into the world to organise law, education and all forms of social order. As Marion Royce put it in her report in the World's Y.W.C.A. *Monthly,* "The necessity for Christian groups to be aware of the implications of their faith in relation to vast social developments of the present day was emphasised. It was agreed that in order to encourage a sense of world solidarity among Christian students in meeting such issues, definite assistance in social analysis might well be provided by the Federation. Such current universal issues as colonialism, trade unionism, the co-operative movement, organisation for world peace and the treatment of minority peoples could be opened up for discussion and action by the national movements in the light of Christian faith and practice."

One of the Indian members characterised our faith by the inseparability of the teachings and the person of Christ. Pure love in the world as it now is can only manifest itself as suffering love. This is the uniqueness of Christianity. "Our old religions," said an African member, "taught us to pray through our ancestors because they are close to God and can mediate for us. Now Christianity teaches us to pray through God's Son who is nearer to God than our ancestors could ever be. That doesn't do away with the good in our old religions, but brings meaning and fulfilment through Christ."

In the matter of collaboration with others, a French member pointed out that we were as Christians too much in the service of the *status quo.* We make mistakes, he pointed out, because we act on a human level, according to what we think is Christian. This is quite different from the pure value of Christianity which is never transposed into human action. We must see, said another, that the Student Christian Movement does not belong to us, but that we belong to it. We belong as Christians to God. God created all. This is the true universalism. This is why the head of the Russian Church prays for all Russians whether they wish for it or not. And a Canadian summed it up: Christianity is power, it is good news—the Gospel. Christ is the centre. As we are drawn into this centre, we form a nucleus of power and then we are ready to fulfil our role in an alien environment. Power for this comes through prayerful and patient study of the Bible.

University Reconstruction

It was well that we devoted considerable time to the area in which we as a Student Christian Movement have power to act in our own right—namely in the university itself. We spoke at first of the differences between countries. We spoke especially of the French system wherewith the State employment of university teachers there was so much greater opportunity for creative liberty. We granted the disintegration of the university—its division into departments and into trade schools; its identification with the prevailing forms of society; its dependence on the winds of political thought; its failure to educate for life. We pointed out how history repeats itself in allowing technical education to become divorced from theological thought. Unless we come to an understanding of what the university is, we are failing God. We are a *Student* Christian Movement; we have a mission to the university. In the words of Arnold Nash, "The Federation must take the lead among the Christian forces of the world in working out a Christian world view within which the conclusions of the specialised subjects of the university curriculum can be given their ultimate meaning in terms of a specifically Christian philosophy of man and his relation to the historical process."

A teacher of physics spoke to the factor of freedom and independence which, through the method of proper observation and logical conclusion, had enabled the development of the natural sciences. He made a distinction as to the role of premises or presuppositions as between the natural and the social sciences. He accepted the necessity for an ultimate view of God as creator of the wonders of the universe whose laws he was teaching, but he was unconvinced by the claim that physics, chemistry or biology would be taught differently by one who did, and by one who did not, hold the same Christian presuppositions.

Listening to this discussion, I felt we needed to work further along the line suggested by Jean Bosc in his article in THE STUDENT WORLD. What happens to the teaching of physics or any other subject when faith does not dictate the methods or results, but submits them to the Holy Spirit? And if this submission can happen in every academic subject, will we have a unified university which does serve the spirit of man and does equip him for life?

There seemed to be general agreement that this is an area in which the Federation definitely has responsibility. As the discussion drew to its end, we made various recommendations. We should try to get faculty groups to start a Christian Professors' Movement. Their purpose should be to work towards the synthesis of knowledge on its Christian presuppositions which is capable of holding its own against the chaos of conflicting "isms" upon which academic subjects

are now taught. We should ask the universities to bring together faculty and student groups in exploratory meetings. We should ask student conferences to take up this subject more fully. One suggestion made by several members was that we initiate some "Ashrams" which among other things would make the subject of evangelism a central one. "What are we doing to set forth Jesus Christ in the universities?" Not just "How are we trying to make individual students become Christians?" but "How can we make the University itself Christian?"

Relief Work

Our discussion of the university led naturally to a consideration of what the Federation should be doing for World Student Relief now and after the war. Robert Mackie told about his talks with André de Blonay and with leaders in the British and Swedish S.C.M.s. Billie Rowland gave an encouraging account of the World Student Service Fund and helped us to see our responsibilities on this continent. There was good response and a request to the Officers for a clear lead. Since then, as you know, the Officers have worked on the document which you and Visser 't Hooft helped us to produce, and it will soon see the light of day. Our thinking for it somewhat colours what follows!

There is a hearty agreement to our continued co-operation with I.S.S. and Pax Romana in the work of World Student Relief both now and in the future. This is the Federation's share in *general* relief. Then there is the *special* work which the Federation must do in its own right to be prepared to help member movements in every possible way. Perhaps our chief problem is how to find the right combination of these two. It's the fine art of collaboration from a Christian basis. It's the importance of having relief workers who are themselves Christians, who take part in the relief work as such. The Chinese have grasped and developed this idea more fully than the rest of us, and it's an area in which we need to do a great deal more thinking!

Summing-up

There was one other subject—the Natural Law, to which we gave two periods. I'm sending you the preparatory material and the "Note for Delegates" rather than attempting a summary of something which I don't yet grasp! We know you are working at this in Geneva, and can help us. Our theologians present were all ready to deal with it, but the rest of us were just floundering. We recognise its importance as a subject for Federation study, and will probably come back to it again as we begin to see its implications more fully.

I hope I've made it clear all along that we were anything but a self-confident group. We were only too aware of the vast changes taking place around us, the significance of which we were only dimly grasping. We were ready to listen and to make changes ourselves. For this reason it is hard to make any conclusions. These are the points which stand out:

1. Christians must acquire more of a grasp of their own faith in order to hold their own in whatever alien environment they may be situated. For this purpose a prayerful and meditative study of the Bible is a first essential.

2. Christians as they become better equipped with the power of their own faith can co-operate with far greater effectiveness with others.

3. Furthermore it is increasingly urgent that Christians should take full part in social, economic and political programs, and train their leaders for such responsibilities.

4. The Federation has a very special responsibility to influence the University towards becoming Christian as a whole with all its teachings oriented to the Christian understanding of God, man and society.

5. In relief and reconstruction work we need a clearer policy on the nature of our specifically Christian contribution.

6. The Federation needs more study of the kind of law and common agreements which can serve as a basis for world order. We want to understand what the biblical interpretation of law offers for this purpose.

When they read this letter many of our Poughkeepsie II members will be far away: one in Oxford, England, another in Callao, Peru, another—with luck—in China. Some will read with approval, and some with dismay, this attempt at a summary! But I think we all can agree that we have taken a step in laying foundations for our future work through the contacts we have made with one another; that we have all gained in insight; and that the Federation is richer far in the assets with which it can go forward.

My greetings to everyone in Geneva.

Yours always,

Helen Morton.

THE EDITOR'S TRAVEL DIARY

My last instalment was written in London, and now, looking back across the Atlantic from Canada, I find there are a few more impressions of my visit to the United Kingdom, which I should like to record.

History, ancient and modern

As I changed trains one day in Carlisle I found directions chalked up on the wall of a station building: "Men for Hadrian's camp assemble here." I looked around furtively for a Roman centurion, but none seemed to be in evidence. only a British corporal in his comfortable and shapeless battle-dress. It is an astonishing experience to the visitor to discover how inevitably Britain-at-war recalls the history of former conflicts. I crossed the bridge over the Wear to climb the citadel of Durham, where undergraduates had invited me to tea. It is a bridgehead which must often have been held against the Scots, and today it has all the appurtenances of defence against an invading army which never came. These grey cities of the East Coast fascinated me—Aberdeen, St. Andrews, Edinburgh and Durham. I walked to my lodging or the train after dark with the moonlight on the crowstepped gables, and the sound of my step on the granite-setts, with always the apprehension that the soldier who brushed past me in the black-out might be wearing coat-of-mail, or have a plaid round his shoulder. The unity of the British people is at bottom a unity of history.

Into that history have gone so many elements that the international medley of the armed forces in the island today seems perfectly natural. In a London tube you may have a Canadian artilleryman on your right and a Norwegian airman on your left; in front of you sits a French naval officer, and beside him is a lieutenant in the Polish cavalry. You may walk through London's Georgian streets, and find every door labelled "Belgian Government", or "American Red Cross —officers' club". I climbed a hillside from my own upland Scottish town, and found the beech tree where the burn gives a sudden music, and lo! a Polish soldier had been there since my last visit, and had made my view over the wide strath his own by carving his name deep into the bole of the tree. Never was there such a mingling of peoples in this ancient countryside; never were the people of Britain more knowledgeable of international affairs. That is surely an encouragement for the future.

The opportunity before the Church

Another impression I had was of the fluidity of the human situation because of the uprooting of men and women from their homes, and the commanding nature of the common enterprise of war. It seemed to me to be a situation in which the Christian Gospel might well have a new chance. And I found in the eagerness and enthusiasm of my old S.C.M. friends that they shared that conviction. I recall a conversation with a fellow-student, now a chaplain, who meets twelve groups of a hundred men apiece each week in their training time to discuss with them the Christian faith. I was not surprised when he said he was putting all he knew into the experience. I looked back to S.C.M. committee retreats on the Clyde, when we talked the night away, and saw how our habit of thinking through religious questions in college days could be used to help another set of men in war-time. One day I met a former woman S.C.M. travelling secretary waiting for a bus in an English Midland city. With a pack on her back she was travelling from one hostel of young girls in industry to another. The old travelling job was being carried on in new conditions: "freshmen" to be welcomed, social situations to be dealt with, leadership to be encouraged, faith to be strengthened. In this new flexibility of the Church there is great hope. Often in the cities one finds a roofless, windowless wreck of a church building; usually there has been neither labour nor materials for restoration, and the parishioners are directed elsewhere for worship. But in one great English city, I found that the Rector, a former Federation secretary, had built a little brick chapel on to the bases of the broken pillars of the nave, with its sanctuary under the tower still standing at the west end. City workers picked their steps over the rubble to worship there. Out of the ashes of the church a new church had arisen, and the new one had lost some of the "furniture" of the old, gaining in simplicity and directness. It seemed a parable of much that is taking place.

The Day of Prayer on the air

In the new international consciousness of Britain the Student Movement House, that famous student club in Bloomsbury, plays an important part. It had a new coat of paint for the visit of the Queen and the Princesses, but the shattered walls of the Indian Students' Union opposite were a stark reminder of its precarious existence in war-time London. Bombs to right of it, bombs to left of it, the club goes on with a larger active membership, and a heightened intellectual and political interest. But it is not only air attacks which make such work precarious. The foundations of 103 Gower Street may be shaken, they tell me, and the foundations of

international relationships are none too firm these days. Avoiding all the political claptrap of those who would build too hurriedly with only the material available in war-time, the club goes forward on its mission of impartiality with its integrity unimpaired. It was therefore a special privilege for me, through the kindness of the Warden, staff and members, to take a broadcast service of worship on the Universal Day of Prayer for Students in the clubroom of the "House". As we met in Christian worship, men and women of many nationalities, and by no means all of our faith, I was conscious once again of the transcending greatness of our Lord Jesus Christ. In Geneva (and perhaps elsewhere?) a little group of Federation leaders and students met to worship with us, and knew beyond all possibility of doubt, that across that frontier of the air, alive with bombers and fighters, we were one in Him.

A Federation discussion in Bloomsbury

One other privilege was possible because of the international character of London: we held a consultative meeting of the W.S.C.F. in the series of "Thinking ahead as Christians" in the Kenilworth Hotel, in Bloomsbury. Invitations were sent to forty busy people, and all accepted, so that in the end we were fifty to sixty strong. Czech, Canadian, American uniforms were in evidence; men in the service of their governments found time to come; sixteen nationalities were represented; a French political leader was the centre of our discussion. But this was essentially a Federation gathering to which men and women came because they cared about the Federation, and desired above all things to remain in its fellowship. We worked hard in that crowded writing room at the back of the hotel, talking with only a little time for sleep from 4 o'clock on a Saturday till 4 o'clock on a Monday. My task from the chair was simply to give what co-ordination I could to a magnificent flow of discussion; there was never any shortage of ideas! An excellent report has been written and appears in this issue. We tried to meet the challenge from the Présinge meeting and pass it on to Poughkeepsie II. Of course it was a scrappy and unfinished discussion—all the best ones are—but it pulsated with life, the true life of our fellowship.

The undercurrent of all our thought was Christian resistance. For some comprehension of where and why a Christian must take his stand we were greatly indebted to our members from the European continent. It is easier to understand Christian resistance in London than in New York, but not very much easier. I recall the frank comment of a British student: "It's all very well for you people who see the Christian front and the national front as intimately related, but we can't find where the real front is." Perhaps one of the best

results of this process of "Thinking ahead as Christians", if we really take it seriously in our own situations, will be to help us as Christians to find where the real front is.

There are two moments in the discussion which stand out in my memory. The first was when our African and Indian members challenged the whole basis of Christian resistance in Europe on the ground that no Christian should ever adopt the tactics and methods of the forces against the Church. They spoke out of their own national experience. In this sphere of the ethics of political resistance there is a real issue which we did not satisfactorily deal with. Again there was the moment when we tussled as to the connection between divine and human retribution. The English theologians were surer of divine sanction for human punishment of evildoers than the continental ones. Perhaps it is around Christian ethics in society that we shall have the sharpest discussion, when we all meet again. At any rate the meeting whetted my appetite for my visit to Sweden, which had now moved from the stage of being a hope, to being a possibility. There, I thought, I shall come closely in touch with men and women who know where they stand as Christians, and, having done all, will stand. I was not to be disappointed.

Is your journey really necessary?

These ominous words confront you as you purchase your ticket in any British railway station. They kept running in my head as I waited in a northern town for word of my flight to Stockholm. The other passengers were, or looked, important; an air of mystery hung over the whole performance; and as I donned parachute harness and life-belt I had a feeling that someone would point out that my journey had nothing to do with the war effort. But Sweden had invited me, and to Sweden, said the powers that be, I could go. There is a Providence that watches over the ecumenical organisations in war-time, but it has its agents in friendly folk in key positions, who believe in the Una Sancta.

I admit a sense of being glad to be where I was, when the wireless operator removed our oxygen masks with the comment "over Sweden now", and produced an excellent cup of coffee. And then the lights of Stockholm lay beneath our blackout-ridden eyes like a cloak of diamonds spread before a king, and in a trice we were on foot in that regal city. I could scarcely go to bed for lingering at my window to admire that superlatively beautiful town hall of Stockholm, stepping down to the water, as they say, like a stag to drink. Was it really true that I was in Europe again? The morning proved it so. I pottered round, as so often before, trying to change my money; and as I watched the river under the bridges, and the white steamboats tied to the jetties, I found myself looking for a "mouette"

to take me across the lake to the Palais Wilson, and realised with a sad shock that I had not got quite so far as Geneva! But almost as far, for I lunched with Miss Woodsmall of the World's Y.W.C.A.

Gothenburg and Lund

The arrangements for my visit were as perfect as Swedish hospitality could make them. Harry Johansson, who is a member of the W.S.C.F. executive, Birgit Rodhe, the general secretary of the Swedish Church S.C.M., and Gunnar Ander, general secretary of the Free Church S.C.M., welcomed me as an old friend, and thought of everything that might make my stay of value to the Federation. With Birgit Rodhe, as a vivid and delightful travelling companion, I boarded a train marked Oslo; but happily we changed before it left neutral territory! Away in the birch woods beside a lake I visited the school where Martin Lindström, well known in Federation circles, is headmaster. My first talk was to the boys of the school and how quick they were to understand my English witticisms, and to catch a vision of the Federation. On to Gothenburg, where we had a Federation banquet like any American college, followed by a service led by students under the great crucifix of an old church. Then we walked the streets with happy talk and serious discussion until we caught the midnight train. A parting shot was: "Be sure not to go across the ferry to Copenhagen! But if you do, we shall send you books to lighten your internment!"

The next two days were spent at Lund, that charming cathedral and university city, which I had visited nine years before to attend a W.S.C.F. Theological Students' conference. The gracious building of the S.C.M. in its quiet cobbled side street was the setting of some very interesting discussions, in which I learnt how Swedish students viewed the war. It was characteristic of Sweden that the main room should be lined with shelves of books. This is a country where, as a friend said, "learning is autonomous", and therefore a country where the student *Christian movement studies.*

Uppsala and Stockholm

On we travelled to Uppsala, where I had long talks with Mr. Josefson the scholarly chairman of the S.C.M. And here it may be said that one of the joys of visiting Sweden is to see the beauty of its family life. Here the home is still the centre, where husband and wife share intellectual and domestic interests, and parents and children live their lives in natural companionship. We walked at night through the old city, and wandered through the house of one of the "nations", watching students studying, conversing, playing chess, always with that air of cultured independence which Swedish uni-

versity education seems to produce. I called on the Archbishop in his high study looking out on the spires of the cathedral, and as he saw me gravely out of his palace door he gave me his blessing for the Federation. It was no idle gesture; it strengthened me on my way.

In Stockholm we had a meeting in a building of which I could not pronounce the name, and therefore found hard to locate. I was interviewed for the college paper by a fascinating young woman with a mane of fair hair, but what she made of our conversation I shall never know! Then we sauntered through the streets, with two Russian friends in our company, talking of other days, until we found ourselves in the old city behind the cathedral. Up and up a winding staircase I dragged my weary feet, and found another charming evening meal, followed by evensong. There is no country in the world where a group of students will turn more naturally from discussion or from laughter to their prayers. The chairs move round, the candles are lit, and men and women are on their knees before the altar. The Swedish S.C.M. does not need to discuss its relation to the churches; it is in the Church.

Human sympathy and the Christian mission

Sometimes, as I told my Swedish friends, I missed the students of North America. Beyond his Bible study and his worship it is hard for the Swedish students to look. The consciousness of belonging to a small country, and a neutral country, affect his thinking. He will talk about the powerful neighbouring countries with passion and alarm, but world problems as a whole do not catch his attention. "Norden", the Scandinavian unity, is often on his lips; it is the one political concept that holds him, and it seems to limit his horizon. Yet all this breaks down when you speak of the suffering of the students in Europe and the Far East. I was greatly moved by the response of students and graduates to the suffering of Finland, and Norway, of Belgium and Greece. Allied student prisoners owe much to the thoughtfulness of Swedish students in sending precious notebooks for their studies, and the question was even raised how they could possibly send German textbooks to prison camps in Canada and the States.

It may not be out of place to point out that Birgit Rodhe and her husband are really missionaries in training, and that Yngve Frykholm, of the European Student Relief Fund, was born in India and means to return. Politically some nations are at a disadvantage in this warring world, and that is apt to narrow the vision of students. But as Christians Swedish students have a superb opportunity now, and for the future, of that ministry of reconciliation, which may begin with

raising funds for student relief, continue with a work of interpretation in a post-war world, but always has its real basis in the Christian mission in the world.

What have you done for those who suffer?

In Sweden I sometimes forgot all about the war and felt like any tourist in strange surroundings. Then something would catch my eye; perhaps it was that notice over the headquarters for the relief of Belgian children: "For the sake of Queen Astrid" of fragrant memory, or that poster of a mother and child, which hung from the lamp standards of Stockholm with the inscription: "What have you done for Norway?" Once in Lund I stepped into a garden court and my guide knocked on a door; out came a slender Finnish student still in his officer's uniform; beside him stood a great Alsatian dog which eyed me doubtfully; we shook hands clumsily and I realised that he was blind. And yet that student was fortunate, for fifty per cent. of his fellow students had given their lives in the "winter war". I talked with a professor from a Baltic country, whose quiet comment looking to the future was: "If we must die, it will be better to die fighting." I talked with Norwegian students "by themselves", as my Swedish friends were careful to arrange, and heard what it meant to be driven from their country. Just over the border on either side of this pleasant land was suffering unspeakable; from all over Europe seemed to come the cries of men and women who cannot share the superficial buoyancy of those who view the war from the outside.

One of my great delights was to meet my friend and colleague, André de Blonay, from Geneva. For hours and hours we talked in a little room high in the tower of the hostel in the beautiful little town of Sigtuna. It was part of the kindness of our Swedish friends that I should have this peaceful setting in which to meet those who could tell me about Europe. We talked of prisoners of war, and of how hardly confinement bears upon the souls of men. Especially we talked of those forgotten prisoners, who get no Red Cross parcels regularly from their homelands, but sit and wonder whether they will ever have any homeland again. I was very glad for two things, firstly that our work of student relief is so much more personal than the work of the great organisations, and secondly that it pays particular attention to those prisoners whose countries are occupied and whom national funds raised in the free countries do not help. I marvelled all over again at the loyal service of our friends in Switzerland and Sweden, neutral in war but positive in charity. Our own World Student Relief and the War Prisoners' Aid of the Y.M.C.A. are doing a work of mercy on a truly creative and international basis, which we must support with every ounce of energy we have.

As André de Blonay and I talked four days away with our Swedish friends beside us we tried to keep the total needs of students, and their future needs before us. Great responsibilities lie ahead of the World's Student Christian Federation, of Pax Romana and of International Student Service. We must stand together in all the work of restoring student life. And we must stand together in the sense of East and West. Time and again we turned our thoughts to the great work of student relief being carried on in China. Distress has a certain universality about it, so must have the measures taken to meet it. As I sent off our joint cable to Chungking from Uppsala it was with a sense of the oneness of our task now and in days ahead.

Christian resistance

From varied sources there filtered through to me news of our fellow movements in occupied Europe, though there were some sad gaps of silence. The news has been recorded in the Federation News Sheet, *but this is the place for some general impressions. First of all comes* resistance. *There is something about a student Christian movement, which makes it refuse to die. It may change its form of organisation, or even disappear altogether officially, but still the witness for which it stands will be maintained. Indeed it may be maintained even more effectively, for unexpected groups are attracted to a movement which will never give in. There is nothing here peculiar to students, or their organisation, it is a power of resistance which they share with the whole Christian Church. Indeed it is within the Church today that our European movements find their life. I talked with a Norwegian theological student who had come with his bride across the dangerous mountain frontier to be ordained in Sweden. He had come because he belonged to the Church, because the Church needed him, because he must go forward in her service. His action had nothing to do with personal ambition; it was the act of a man under orders. His wife of a few days had known Bishop Berggrav, the courageous Norwegian Church leader now interned by the occupying power. Into his captivity on his birthday she had smuggled a cake of her own baking, on which she had inscribed* Ecclesia militans, ecclesia triumphans. *That is Christian resistance. Who would not be drawn into such a fellowship?*

Unity and hope

The next thing that struck me was the unity of resistance. *It began with my discovering that Norwegian students in Sweden had raised money to send food to Greek students, and to keep a German Jewish refugee in college—"to show which side they were on". In Europe our fellow Christians are thinking less and less in national*

terms; they understand the meaning of international civil war. The only integrating force left in Europe today is that from which Eurpoe took its origin, the Christian Church. While on the outside we still concern ourselves with national and political divisions, inside our fellow Christians are being welded into a unity upon which the future of civilisation may be rebuilt. The process is a painful one not only because of restriction and persecution, but because the human spirit is rebellious and divisive, but a transformation of the Christian Church is taking place which can only fill the observer's heart with awe.

Perhaps it was because I caught a glimpse of that transformation that I found myself strangely uplifted. It is debilitating to be fed on hope of what may happen after victory; it is strengthening to come in contact with a hope which rests in the promises of God. "He that is down need fear no fall." Those who rely on military or political salvation alone cannot really experience the help of God. Those who have no resources in the world at all can draw upon all the powers of heaven itself. It is a very old discovery, and I came to the edge of it. From Europe, since I returned, a message has come to me, from a city in the Ruhr destroyed by bombing "May God be with us all; our hope is in Him." That is not despair, that is Christian hope as few of us experience it.

Britain again and the Atlantic

I flew back to Britain and in twenty-four hours was speaking to my own Scottish folk on a quiet Sunday morning. It was a peculiar privilege after three years absence in America to be interpreting European Christians to British Christians. Understanding is quick, for the bonds of Christian unity have grown stronger in the war. I found the British S.C.M. deeply conscious of the suffering in Europe, and of the needs of their fellow Christians. The part of "reconstruction" which especially holds their attention is that of bringing assistance in every way they can when hostilities cease to the student Christian movements which have suffered so cruelly. There is here no mere expression of sympathy but a determination to help. Before I left for America there were plans on foot to raise funds for this work of Christian solidarity, which have since borne fruit. When I returned to my fellow-officers in America I could speak of the lead which the British S.C.M. had given us in our planning to restore the shattered outward life of our member movements, in which today the inner life runs so strong.

Early in April I stood once again on a cold quay waiting for the preliminaries of embarkation. A corporal looked up from his desk as he took down my particulars. "The S.C.M. is part of this World's

Student Christian Federation is it not? I was a member in London. Good luck to you." And as I sought out my cabin I found another old "Amsterdam 1939" delegate in it. And so once again within the fellowship I crossed the Atlantic. We were a company of men from many countries. I talked with Czechs, and Dutch, Belgians and Greeks, Canadians and Americans. I was attracted by two young British naval officers poring over a little book in the smoke room. What zeal for their work, I thought. But later I found the book was the Iliad. *I overheard the remark of one of the translators as he straightened his back, and knocked out his pipe, "Well, if we can't be correct, let's be consistent."*

Perhaps it is this dry spirit of compromise which exasperates Americans! I wonder. There seemed to be so little conversation between the British and Americans on the ship, that I began to reflect on our differences and our similarities, and how they keep us apart. Then I remembered two incidents which had united us as one man. The first was at the port of embarkation when an American sailor came on to the tender with a wild look in his eyes, saying: "Has anyone seen my buddy? I have not set eyes on him since our ship went down?" The second was when I came upon a young American officer working at a gun with British ratings. Some hitch had occurred which had produced an atmosphere of smothered gaiety, and even the spectators were caught up in it. The experience of war is bringing the two peoples together, and surely it is not beyond our wits to find an even more compelling loyalty in the great tasks which will follow.

R. C. M.

THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

Karl Fries

1861-1943

First Chairman of the World's Student Christian Federation, 1895-1920

If I had heard in February that Karl Fries had died, I should have known that one of the great leaders of the Federation had left us; but when the news came to me in June, I knew that I had lost a friend. For it was my privilege to meet Dr. and Mrs. Fries for the first time in March, 1943. Sometimes a visit is in itself a benediction, and this was one such. There he sat, looking so much younger than his years, unable to walk, but with THE STUDENT WORLD and Suzanne de Dietrich's *Rediscovering the Bible* at his hand, and the bound volumes of Federation minutes on a shelf above his head. I had expected to inform him of present-day events of the W.S.C.F. but instead I was asked searching questions about the new movements in Latin America. Here was one to whom the Christian service of students was still the first concern. I was humbled to think that all our work was still being tested by a watchful, active mind, which had seen it in its beginning.

We talked of Vadstena, 1895, as if it had been yesterday, and his eyes sparkled as I said how much I hoped he would meet there with some of us in 1945. He will not be there in person, but his contribution to the Federation is not an affair of dates. One of the new lights he gave me on that historic meeting was his mention of the inscription over the gateway of the castle, *auxilium meum a Domino*. Some movements, and some lives, depend always on the help of God. And so we turned to prayer from our talk, as men find it so hard to do today, and in the English tongue he prayed that God would bless the two friends, whose tributes follow mine, and you and me, and students everywhere in this distracted world. And I felt that this was the kind of prayer which God never fails to answer, and took courage.

ROBERT C. MACKIE.

Karl Fries and I entered on our life of Christian service on the same day, September 1, 1888—Fries in Sweden in the work of the Young Men's Christian Association of that country, and I as a Secre-

tary of what was then called the Intercollegiate Young Men's Christian Association Movement of the United States and Canada. At that time we had not met one another but did so some months later on the occasion of the first of several visits by Fries to North America. Thereafter we met at intervals, notably at the World's Conference of the Young Men's Christian Association at Amsterdam in 1891 and the Jubilee Conference of the Young Men's Christian Association in London in 1894. It was on the occasion of the second of these two meetings that I shared with Fries the vision that was beginning to command me of a world-wide Christian Student Movement. It was the beginning of a warm friendship and attachment, which ever deepened across the decades.

Then came the significant and creative meeting in Vadstena Castle in Sweden in the summer of 1895. In response to my vision, the North American Movement committed itself officially in favour of a world-wide union of Christian student societies; next what was then called the British College Christian Union unanimously endorsed the plan; following that the German University Christian Alliance, after more prolonged and difficult negotiations, heartily approved the idea. Then Dr. Johannes Siemsen of Germany, Dr. J. Rutter Williamson, of Britain, Luther D. Wishard, representing scattered Christian societies of students in colleges of mission lands, and myself representing the North American Student Movement, proceeded to Sweden at the time of the assembling there of the Christian students and professors of all the universities of Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland. This body, after due deliberation, decided to lend its influence in favour of the creation of a truly world-wide fellowship of Christian students, and appointed as their representatives to meet with those who had come from abroad, Dr. Karl Fries, of Sweden, and Pastor K. M. Eckhoff, of Norway. The six delegates thus appointed met for several days in the garret at the top of the Vadstena Castle and during that period came to a unanimous agreement to form the World's Student Christian Federation and framed its constitution.

Fries was elected to serve as Chairman, a position which he held for twenty-five years. I was appointed General Secretary and occupied this position throughout the same period. At the end of this period Fries resigned and I served as his successor during the larger part of the following decade.

Dr. Fries was an ideal Chairman. Throughout a quarter of a century he administered with marked ability his great trust. During these years he maintained his habits and tastes as a student and kept up his contacts with creative personalities in the realm of thought as well as of action. His knowledge and proficiency in the use of several languages—Swedish, Danish, English, German, French, Latin

and others—was an immense asset to one serving such a world-wide organisation. He had a passion for evangelism and ever held in a place of central prominence the pronouncedly Christian and missionary objective of the Federation. His fraternal and co-operative spirit enabled him to command the confidence and following of the students of the many lands and races associated with the Federation. The word "ecumenical" had not come into general use in his day but he to a remarkable degree exemplified and fostered the truly ecumenical ideal and spirit, that is, a world-wide or universal Christian community transcending all barriers of nation, race, or denomination. In this connection it is interesting to recall that Archbishop Soderblom, one of the two or three most outstanding leaders of the modern ecumenical movement, was a fellow student of Dr. Fries, and these two men maintained their intimate creative fellowship throughout the many years.

Fries attended and presided over nearly all of the meetings of the Federation and its General Committee during the quarter of a century of his administration. Moreover, he and I managed to get together somewhere and sometime in nearly every year during our joint administration. We also kept up a constant and intimate correspondence. Fortunately, Fries was able to travel more widely than most chairmen of international bodies. First and last he made visits to the countries of the Far East, to Southern Asia, to the lands of the Near East, to nearly every part of Europe and made several visits to North America. It would be difficult to overstate the importance of the contribution which he thus made to the Federation during the foundation-laying, precedent-setting and truly missionary epoch in the life of the Federation.

JOHN R. MOTT.

When your letter came telling me that Dr. Fries had passed on, my first instinct was to look through the files of his correspondence with Dr. Mott, and see the Federation Cavalcade 1895-1920, the years of his chairmanship of the Federation. But long before the Vadstena Conference 1895, the strands of Karl Fries' life were woven into Federation origins.

He was a student at Uppsala University—Semitic languages were his subject, for he meant to be a missionary—and he helped to start the Uppsala Missionary Association, which was a forerunner of the Swedish S.C.M. It was to Karl Fries that the "Make Jesus King" message, sent from the first Japanese Student Conference to American students at Northfield in 1889, was passed on; it proved the inspiration which started the first biennial Scandinavian Student Christian Conference, and led to the Scandinavian S.C.M.

It was at the third of these conferences at Vadstena in 1895 that

the Federation came into being, and Karl Fries, at the age of thirty-three, became its chairman. John R. Mott had foreseen his unique value to the Federation, and at the British S.C.M. Conference in 1895, in discussing the hoped for Federation had suggested that it would be good if "the Chairman could belong to one of the smaller countries"—someone "outside international jealousies, neither American nor British nor French nor German", and thought that one Karl Fries of Sweden was eminently fitted. So it proved, for Dr. Fries was always sensitive on international questions; revealed many "continental difficulties to the Anglo-Saxon; interpreted opposing views when crises arose, e.g., during the Boer War between the Dutch and the British; while as a "neutral" during and after World War I, he could visit both the "Central Powers" and the "Allies", and always played a reconciling part. He had his prejudices, like the rest of us, but he never rode them hard, and only his intimate friends knew of them; he was more of a diplomatist than appeared on the surface, and helped to smooth out many an international tangle; and many men, who differed from him widely, he led into the Federation, and ecumenical movements.

He had remarkable linguistic powers. Besides Swedish, which carried him through all Scandinavian lands, he spoke French, German and English with equal and complete facility, and could turn from one to another at a moment's notice. He could read many other tongues, and it is recorded that he learnt by heart and delivered an address in Finnish, which he did not know, at a critical conference in Finland. Many an important article he translated for those of us who had not his skill. The Federation publications owed much to his interest and sound advice.

He had many other qualities invaluable in a Federation chairman —endless patience, untiring industry and perseverance, fundamental humility and imperturbable good temper. The only thing that ever roused him to wrath was if an unfair attack was made on any of his friends. Of these he had many; and deserved to have. The riches of his knowledge and his spirit, which he so freely shared with us, his loyalty, his ready and unfailing kindness, his belief in us have enriched the lives of many of us.

Besides the Federation he had two great loves: the world-wide missionary enterprise and the Young Men's Christian Association. What he loved in all three was that he saw in them chosen instruments to proclaim Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour throughout the earth. He lived his life for the evangelisation of the world; above all else he was a man of faith, overcoming faith, and a man of prayer. He walked with God, and helped the Federation to do so. And so for him we say *Laus Deo* and *Sursum Corda.*

Ruth Rouse.

Scandinavian News and Views

The following excerpts are translated by Birgit Rodhe, General Secretary of the Swedish Student Christian Movement, from Forbundet, *the Norwegian S.C.M. magazine, and from* Ad Lucem, *a Finnish S.C.M. magazine. With this issue,* Forbundet *comes to an end, but in the words of the editorial, "After the war we will take up our great tasks again."*

Forbundet: From an editorial

FINIS

"The Christian Press is hard hit exactly when it is most alive and growing. It is a catastrophe when such publications as *Norsk Kirkeblad* and *Kirke og Kultur* (The Norwegian Church Magazine and Bishop Berggrav's magazine *Church and Culture*) which have been important factors in our spiritual life for decades are stopped. It is also hard that the parish bulletins have been hit by rationing and lack of paper.

"And now the turn of *Forbundet* has come. With this number we come to an end. We were never sure of being able to continue, but in spite of this, the blow is hard to take, for we believe in our task.

"The war situation had already restricted our spiritual freedom of movement. From the beginning we felt handicapped, but gradually we found our place, and saw that our task was to concentrate on the Christian message and to stand together with the Church. Its word to our people should be our word to the academic world.

"The stopping of *Forbundet* hits us especially hard because we are in the midst of a time of great crisis in the history of our movement. We do not know how we shall come out of this crisis, but we are already able to state that we are in contact with more students, and that more come to our meetings, and that there is more eager listening. At the same time there is a greater orientation towards Christ and more interest in missions. The emphasis has shifted from Christianity as such to Christ as a person.

"We ask you not to forget two things which have been close to our hearts:—the missionary idea and the Christian fellowship in 'Norden'.[1] . . . Finally let us remember and always remind one another that we are a movement and that the inner contact between groups is most fully realised when we stand praying together from coast to coast around the same Word of God.

"After the war, we will take up our great tasks again!"

[1]"Norden" is the conception of a Scandinavian unity embracing Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland. Ed.

Forbundet: From a leading article

THE INNER AND OUTER LIFE

"It is evident that our inner life is to some extent dependent upon our outer life. But as our body is dependent on food, so is the quality of our inner life dependent on spiritual nourishment. We have often seen that Christian life grows more lax as we fail to go to church, or cease to read the Bible for a period of time. *Forbundet* has the task of spiritual nourishment. It has strengthened the individual and through him the community.

"But if the outer life breaks down, what about it? Will our inner life suffer the same fate as the body for lack of food? That depends upon the foundations of the inner life. If it is built upon the sands it will fall. But if it is built upon a rock, it will stand, come what may. The Christian life is built by the Grace of God, and only the Grace of God decides whether it shall or shall not be. And is it not often true that under external pressures, the spirit of God has greater possibilities of working inside us?

"Christian life will never become poor. The curious thing about it is that it grows richer and richer, the poorer we become outwardly. On condition however, that we do not hide behind hate and bitterness, but open our life to Him who knocks. He is the way of truth, love and peace, He who had no place to lay his head, yet was always rich.

"Wherever I may be, and however, the world may stand, I live in a community of faith, a communion of Saints, where the only condition for the strength of life is that I permit the Spirit of God to work and never forget that my absolute dependence lies in my prayers to God both for myself and for others."

Ad Lucem: An editorial

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP IN NORDEN

"Norden" is the slogan of the day in many places. There is nothing bad about that. On the contrary, we should be glad that there are those with enough spiritual height, even in the realm of imagination, in this golden age of isolation, to see something greater than what is mine or ours. Or perhaps these supporters of the nordic idea do not see what is greater? The idea has been mostly presented as a matter of common interest or political expediency. We stand together so far as it is worth our while. There is not much of moral quality here worthy of praise.

Fellowship must be founded on more than advantage to self—even on sacrifice—in any case at least on confidence and if possible

on love. It has been said so often but so often forgotten, that Christianity alone has the solution of the problems of the times. Only practical Christianity is able to save our world. Lasting peâce is unthinkable which is not based on Christian love and has not grown out of its fruits. The ecumenical movement, the nordic fellowship will remain in the realm of mere theory unless it has the real foundation which only Christian love surmounting all barriers can provide. Today, we rejoice in the fact that this foundation is not entirely lacking. Think of the nordic Christian student conferences. Think of the 500 at Abo, who felt such unity of heart and soul. And how many of the Norwegians who were present then, have their freedom now? How many of that fellowship are suffering today for our common faith? Should we then, not suffer, too—should we not feel the bonds of nordic fellowship?

If the world, if Norden is to recover from all the wounds which now drip with blood, it must be through Christian fellowship. As Christians we must remember the task which is ours—the God-given task of making peace and building up community.

Ad Lucem: By a Finnish delegate

THE WINTER CONFERENCE OF THE SWEDISH S.C.M. IN SIGTUNA

It has long been known that to go to the winter conference of the Swedish S.C.M. is quite an exceptional experience. Not only is a trip to Sweden in itself a sensation these days, but the opportunity for personal contact with those who see things somehow at a distance is of importance and encouragement. This year the winter conference was especially international in character. Not only were the four Scandinavian countries represented, but also Hungary and France, and above all André de Blonay who represented for us both Relief work and the Federation. To us Finnish delegates the contact with these people meant a new conception of the world situation and of our relation to it. No matter how much is written in the press, nor how hard we may try to portray the situation in letters, only personal contacts create real understanding. These contacts surmounting all frontiers, which the conference provided, were of decisive importance to us both as Christians and as individuals belonging to a suffering humanity.

Nor was this perspective the only one. The other and greater one was the conception of God, given in the motto of the conference "I believe in God, the Father Almighty". From the introductory address of the Chairman, Dr. Ruben Josefson, to the closing sermon by the Dean of Uppsala, this was the main theme and spirit of the

meetings, for "Of Him, and through Him and to Him are all things."

The first day was a day of theoretical outlook with addresses on the biblical faith of Creation, the modern scientific conception of the world, and a Bible meditation on the new creation in Christ. The next day brought matters closer home to us, with addresses on *The Worth of Human Life* and on *The Goods of this Life*. There could have been no better subject for the evening's meditation than "Seek ye first the kingdom of God". Sunday was the climax of the conference with the Holy Communion Service in the mediæval church of St. Mary, where the Archbishop of Uppsala, Dr. E. Eidem, preached most movingly on "The ships on the sea, and the three articles of Faith". The church was filled with young people and the singing of the hymns was most impressive. This communion service showed once more how Christian youth is again putting the sacrament into the centre of Christian life. Outside the sun was shining and the snow melting into the brooks. The warm breaths of wind announcing light and spring to the world also spoke to us of the world of the spirit. Dean Anderberg knew how to express what we were feeling: "of Him and through Him and to Him" is not only the history of creation and of man, but life can only come to perfection when the wholeness and the overwhelming power of God runs through the whole being.

No picture could be complete without mentioning two important parts of the programme—the group discussions and the social Saturday evening. Each of them provided personal contacts, and awoke our sense of responsibility, not only as between individuals and Christians, but also between peoples and nations.

It is a simple fact that the Sigtuna Conference of 1943 is now a memory. But this time it is not only a memory. I think that most of us went away with a new perspective on the Kingdom of God, and also on the relations between nations and peoples in a torn and devastated Europe. And all of us, I think, want to do something towards the peace for which we long so much—that it may be a just one, and that as Christians we may be able to make our voices heard.

Th. E.

THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine of the World's Student Christian Federation

ROBERT C. MACKIE, *Editor.*

Temporary addresses of the Editor, 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., U.S.A., and 151 Bloor Street W., Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada.

Volume XXXVI Fourth Quarter, 1943 Number 4

EDITORIAL

Making Decisions and Renewing Principles

In September 1942, five European students drew up a document at Présinge in Switzerland, and appealed to "their comrades in other lands to help them to study more deeply and to state more clearly" certain pressing problems. Two of the problems particularly attracted attention, and influenced discussion, at the Federation consultative meetings held a few months later in London and in New York State. This issue of THE STUDENT WORLD, *which arose out of those meetings, may therefore be considered as a preliminary answer to that appeal of a year ago. Let us see what the problems were.*

"Christian ethics. *The problem of the basis of Christian ethics presents itself to us today in a very different way from that in pre-war Europe. In the occupied countries convinced Christians find themselves in situations where they are forced to recognise that the moral conceptions, which have seemed sufficient till now, cannot help them to solve the concrete problems which face them.*

"The basis of law. *The problem of law is perhaps the most fundamental which faces us. We see with horror on the continent*

of Europe today what a world without law is like. . . . The complete upheaval of the whole tradition of continental Europe, the heritage of a civilisation interpenetrated by Christianity, faces us with a problem very different from that which faces the English-speaking countries. There the already existing standards of values survive, and their concern is to keep their life at the level of those standards. But for all of us the so-called Christian standards have given way in the war. In the face of a rising anarchy solid foundations must be found."

These two inter-related problems have aroused widespread interest in the Federation because, although they appear in a desperately acute form in occupied Europe, they are universal problems, which present themselves to thoughtful Christians everywhere. As an English student puts it in the London discussion: "We also face the problem of doing evil in a good cause. To the European experience of telling lies, forging papers, hiding foodstuffs and the like might be added the comment of a reader of The Student World *now at a bomber station in Britain: "They know that they are going to 'do in' lots of women and children and they have a great compassion for them. . . . It's a horrid job and it's got to be done, and that's all there is to it." This is surely a generation of youth which is faced with cruelly difficult moral decisions. Some meet them more sharply than others but the only real distinction is between sensitive and insensitive consciences. As the American student puts it in the London discussion: "Those people who are able to do completely moral jobs can only do so because other people are fighting." But there are "no completely moral jobs", and we all share the burden of the dilemma, even those of us who are still in free universities.*

A new feature however in this age-old ethical discussion is the fact that the European students see the problem of ethics related to the problem of law. This again is not confined to Europe. After saying: "We also face the problem of doing evil in a good cause", the English student significantly adds: "What are the positive things in which we can trust?" The difficulty of moral compromise is vastly increased when you become uncertain of the laws on which you are basing your compromise. Making decisions is peculiarly

hard when you are uncertain of the principles behind them. And that is the position of many younger people today. The suggestion was made by the European group that in the English-speaking countries the already existing standards of value survived. In a sense this is true, but it is difficult to say whether it is in a fundamental or superficial sense. The real contrast in this discussion so far seems rather to be between "western" Christians and those of the "younger churches". It is the African and Indian representatives in London who speak of "absolute standards"; it is the Chungking group, which in answering the four questions put by the Officers of the W.S.C.F., speaks of nations obeying the divine law, and suggests the relevance of the "Mandate of Heaven". We are obviously only at the beginning of our Federation study of the meaning of law. That is why the articles by our two leaders in Geneva are so timely.

Perhaps the most useful thing to do in this editorial is not to attempt a summary of the different views expressed, but to pick out a thread of agreement. It is clear, in the first place, that one of the best ways in which we can prepare ourselves as Christians to face the ethical decisions of our day is by reading our Bibles. The real place of decision and of consolation may be in prayer, but if we pray without our Bibles, we merely day-dream. And here the divisions amongst us in attitude to the Bible are not so great as would appear. Dorothy Emmet disclaims the use of the phrase "obedience to the Word of God" and then gives an admirable description of true reliance upon it. At bottom we know that our one hope in the intolerable moments of decision, or of reflection upon the consequences of decision, is our relationship to Jesus Christ. He becomes real to us as we read the Bible. In a true sense we know we are not lost, if He has not lost us.

Secondly, there is a good sentence in the London discussion by a French leader: "The only possibility of rebuilding is on religious grounds, not moral, for the moral system is completely overthrown." Certainly that has often been true in the life of the individual, and, if in society also moral principles have gone, it is only through their faith that individuals can receive guidance. For our "religious grounds" we must again look to the Bible, and

as we read it we realise that God has a law for His people, and we are His people. This is a law which we cannot merely memorise, but must ever again rediscover with all the pains which Suzanne de Dietrich shows us how to take. Thus, whatever be the "pros" and "cons" of natural law, our business as a Christian community is to bring what we have come to know of the will of God to bear upon the habits and convictions of society.

Finally, if we are doing this job as Christians we shall not be afraid of collaboration with non-Christians, or secular organisations. When we fail to act as Christians in *the world, it is usually because we have forgotten that we are not* of *the world, and therefore have something to bring into it. Perhaps the Christian Church today in some countries and situations is bringing more than we realise. After speaking of "sensitivity of conscience" and "tension of mind" Dorothy Emmet writes: "Those who act in this spirit . . . may in fact be discovering real sanctions behind code and custom, and so making possible a renewal of moral principles." We may live in a period when it is hard to make decisions, but what joy it would be if out of that wrestling of the mind and spirit, amidst all the raw suffering of our day, great moral principles were being renewed. They were renewed once upon a Cross.*

R. C. M.

The Ethics of Political Resistance

A discussion in London recorded by Margaret House

An Irishman: I have been reading with great interest the document produced by this group of people who met at Présinge in Switzerland last summer. It pulls us up pretty sharply here in London. We don't think nearly hard enough about our duty as Christians to our state. They have had to face in real life problems that are still theoretical to us here—we must seem very remote from occupied Europe.

A Chinese: Yes—I should like to know more about their views—on Anglo-American leadership for one thing! And in general I agree that we want to know whether our loyalty is due first to our nation, or to the world, or to God.

An African: The Présinge questions are difficult for Africans. Our S.C.M.s are just starting and we have quite enough difficulties as students. Students are keen nationalists—sometimes bitter ones. What principles are we to apply? How should a Christian face the pull between native and British government? We need help in developing a Christian sense of responsibility.

An American: It is essential to this discussion that we should discover the fundamental basis of the Christian ethic. In the Présinge document the only criterion offered for discerning the will of God is the Bible. There is also Christian history, and the history of the Christian church. Christianity must also act in view of what the *future* demands.

A Frenchman: The past is gone, we cannot see the future, and there is so much to do in the present! The old world is dead, and we don't want it back. God is speaking to us in the events of this present life, and the Church and the S.C.M. must decide on the answer. In France we had no theoretical discussion about the State, but were presented with the fact of a State, under the domination of the enemy, taking no account of human liberty. Christians, especially the S.C.M., were in the van of the resistance movement before there was any hope of achieving anything. We were driven by an inner compulsion. "Realism" demanded collaboration; Vichy was "realist". Ours was rather a "concrete

spiritualism", obedience to something higher than "reality", which compelled us to obey. In the S.C.M. we felt that a deep experience of Christianity had been undergone—a nation was killed, descended into hell, and rose again. Those who rebuild are those who have *felt* Good Friday; it is they who are pressing the Church to speak as the Church. Our belief in the supreme value of personality is not deduced from natural law, but from the historical fact that Christ died for men. All follows from that—human life, society, the nation, must be the setting for *that*. There cannot be two sovereigns: if God is sovereign the State cannot be. As Christians we have a higher calling than our own nation.

But in the sphere of action great new problems are presented. At the present time all who are not traitors are fighting in the resistance movements, and in this fight itself there are all kinds of moral difficulties. We cannot avoid compromise and lies. We must be *in* the world, fighting with the weapons that are to hand. But we must try not to be *of* the world; the spiritual part of us must judge and often condemn the active part of ourselves.

An African: There seems to me to be great danger of dimming spiritual strength and deadening your conscience. How are you going to return to normal?

A Frenchman: That is one of the most tragic things in the situation: there is a complete breakdown of moral rules, making great problems for the education of our children. For instance, people are dying of hunger, so we fill in government returns falsely and hide everything. The only possibility of rebuilding afterwards is on religious grounds, not moral, for the moral system is completely overthrown.

An Englishman: In occupied Europe the nature of the human situation is shown up in sharper outline, but the difference between them and us is only one of degree. We also face the problem of doing evil in a good cause. What are the positive things in which we can trust? Are there still some moral standards operating for us all? What is the nature of the basis of our trust in one another? For instance, the resistance movement works behind a façade of deceit, but some great bond binds the body of the people together. The deceit is probably less fundamental than whatever it is that creates the trust.

An African: You are making moral judgments dependent on the spiritual discernment of individuals. How is it possible to

create a new moral standard? Some moral standards cannot change, for they are based on absolute principles.

An Englishman: But in France it is not possible to act at all without breaking some of the rules.

An American: Is not something similar happening in all countries engaged in war? And those people who are able to do completely moral jobs can only do so because other people are fighting.

A German: The Confessional Church has had the same problems: secrecy, and all that is involved in it.

An Englishwoman: I have been trying to think what it is which saves you from moral relativism. In the Bible we get not so much universal moral laws as a positive sense of caring for justice, mercy and truth. The spoken lie is not so bad as the lie in the soul.

A Chinese: But I doubt whether moral standards really are all dead, for something holds Christians and non-Christians together in fighting evil.

An American: Perhaps we can make a distinction between the absoluteness of certain moral principles and the necessity for formulating relevant moral standards for each generation.

A German: After all the same people still know when to lie and when to tell the truth. A man has been known to refuse to tell who wrote a certain document, but has at the same time confessed that he entirely agreed with it.

An African: But will you European Christians please try to think about the difficulties you are creating for a Christian student from the colonies—in relation to the Sedition Bill for instance. I think some things in our country are wrong; but if I spoke my mind I should be ostracised. Should I stick to my point or keep quiet?

An Indian: What will Indian students think of a report of this meeting? Should the S.C.M. in India take part in the Civil Disobedience Movement? In that Movement Gandhi will not let down moral standards—he will have no lying or cheating. He shows how standards remain at times of the greatest crisis. Europe comes for the first time into a situation of evil and is immediately willing to debase her standards. What will be the Indian S.C.M.'s reaction?

A Formosan: Perhaps there is sometimes a possibility of letting down standards—for instance, Abraham was told to sacrifice his son. Perhaps a suspension of ethics is allowed. Jesus commanded people to hate their parents—and the Chinese Christian often had to break away from his family. As for the colonial problem, I have had to consider this question in relation to Formosa. In each case one must weigh up the effects on oneself and others of speaking out on moral issues.

A Dutchman: Things look different according as we consider ourselves to be working against the enemy and working for our own country. Working for our own country we have increased in mutual helpfulness, but against the enemy our only chance is to use the same methods as he uses.

A Scotswoman: How do you define "enemy"? Suppose India or West Africa is driven into a resistance movement against Britain what is our attitude as a Christian movement? Do we say "We are nicer than the Nazis"?

A Bulgarian: There is a great difference from the Christian point of view. The Christian is primarily a citizen of the Kingdom of God, and only secondly a citizen of his own country. He can be loyal to the state when the demands of the two coincide. When the state interferes with beliefs or the worship of God we must resist.

A German: That's what we thought at the beginning of the Church struggle in Germany—that we would resist only when the state interfered with our Church life; but now we see that we must call the state to order when it does wrong in its own sphere.

An Irishman: In my country we are familiar with the attitude, "If the political order suits us we will observe it." We must distinguish between different kinds of law—state law, moral law and Divine Commandment. The Epistle to the Galatians teaches us that no law binds a Christian unconditionally. Moral laws and state laws are rules of thumb that it is usually wise to observe. "A revolution is never justified unless it is successful." Our ultimate criterion should be not whether our government is good for our own country, but whether it is good for the world.

An Indian: Do you think British government is good for India?

An Irishman: That is a political situation needing a political judgment. There is no moral issue between us. We all agree that self-government for India is desirable: the only question is how, or how quickly, it can be brought about.

An Indian: Gandhi says his method would save Japan and Germany as well as India.

A Frenchman: Yes—but is he right? We've seen Nazism too close. Surely the grievance of Africans is not that they are opposed to our standards, but that they want more of them—more freedom, more justice, more equality. But our position in the occupied countries is quite different. We don't want more fascism, more racial discrimination, more *Führer-Prinzip*, but none of them!

Chairman: Shall we ask one of our Frenchmen to sum up?

A Frenchman: Well—it is not true, as some of you seem to have inferred, that in our resistance movements we are at the mercy of mere moral relativism; we are all agreed that there must be universal standards. But in France or Germany it is the very class which upheld these standards in the past which has betrayed them, and as a result they are believed in no longer. So we are waiting for *new* universal standards to be given—some of us see them foreshadowed in the *"Mouvement Esprit"*. We no longer talk about "individuals" for instance, but about the *personne humaine,* thinking of man no longer as an independent being but as a "person" integrated in the community. So we struggle all the time to find true moral standards. But when these universal standards are again widely enough accepted they will still have to be interpreted in moral codes. These moral codes, unlike the universal standards, can be only relative, though they are useful day-to-day rules of thumb. In this world you sometimes have to decide which rule is most important—you cannot always keep the whole law. For example it is agreed that in general it is wrong to tell a lie, but it would be wrong to endanger another man's life in order to preserve one's own "moral purity". At this point in our history we can only live from moment to moment, seeking the will of God in each event as it confronts us; but we are continually on the watch for the emergence of great guiding laws that will have universal validity.

Moral Action for the Christian

Dorothy Emmet

We hear a good deal nowadays about this war being fought for the principles of Christian morality; and when we look at what people who speak like this generally seem to mean, we find that they mean things like "the rights of man", the sanctity of covenants, social security and equality, a "living wage", and the like. How far are these principles distinctively Christian? A cynic might suggest that it is a strange process of thought which starts from "Take no thought for the morrow" and ends with "Support the Beveridge Report for comprehensive social insurance". In fact, what are loosely called "Christian Ethics" are generally speaking the moral principles and customs of European civilisation as they have come down in a blend of Greek moral and political philosophy, Roman Law and Scriptural tradition. This does not necessarily mean that the name "Christian Morality" given to this composite product is a misnomer. It means that there are elements in it other than the distinctively Christian. I want here to ask what the distinctively Christian factor is, and how it is related to the other factors. I believe that some such combination must always obtain. The Gospel by itself, even the whole Bible, does not supply us with all we need in the way of moral laws and codes suitable for all ages; but it gives us a way of looking at moral action which must be brought to bear on the best that can be produced in any age in the way of codes and principles, which are built up by reason and conscience reflecting on experience. So the Gospel in its beginnings presupposed the Jewish Law; later we find it brought to bear as a searchlight of criticism on the material of Stoic morality and Roman Law, and the ethics of medieval Aristotelianism. Perhaps part of our difficulty at the present time is that there is no such body of agreed moral principles on which the Gospel can be brought to bear. Or is the reaffirming of such a body of principles what people mean when they speak of fighting for "Christian Ethics"? My own view is that some such code of principles and ethical behaviour is essential in any age if we are to avoid

moral and social anarchy; but that such principles are not distinctively Christian (which is not to say that they are *un*-Christian). We want to try to understand the relation of such principles to a distinctively Christian kind of moral thinking.

Sticking to our principles

This may become clearer if we first ask what place principles hold in ethical thinking which is not distinctively Christian. By principles we mean generalised rules as to the kind of acts we believe are right (e.g., telling the truth, paying debts, keeping contracts and promises). Some people would say that if we are clear as to our principles, all we have to do is to follow them; that they will tell us what we ought to do in particular situations. All we have to do is to stick to our principles at whatever cost and whatever the consequences. And of course in the majority of cases this is what we ought to do (which is what we should expect, since principles are generalisations as to what, apart from very special considerations, we have come to hold to be the right way of behaving). So if we see that to do a certain action would be to break a promise or to tell a lie, generally speaking that clinches the matter. But can principles provide us with a sure guide in all circumstances? If they are to do so, we must of course be able to work out a very careful system of casuistry, i.e., show what principles apply in difficult cases. "Casuistry" has perhaps unfairly got a rather dubious name and is associated with logic-chopping and twisting. But in the above sense it is an essential part of any moral thinking based on a code of principles. But apart from the difficulties of agreement in questions of casuistry, it also appears that principles may conflict in a given situation and we must break one or the other (e.g. we can only save a life if we tell a lie). In these cases principles will only serve as an infallible guide if we could arrange them in some sort of a scale, so that in cases of conflict we could tell which of the principles involved was the paramount one. To some extent this is what people who maintain the absolute character of principles do (e.g. most pacifists would presumably say that that one should not do violence is a principle paramount over every other consideration). But there is no clear agreement as to what principle is in fact paramount. Pacifists may say non-violence, while Kant said telling the truth, and Catholic moral theologians say the preservation of life.

Regarding the consequences

So most moralists (not Kant) have held that principles by themselves cannot be sufficient to tell us what we ought to do. We have to take into consideration not only the principle involved but also the estimated consequences of our act. We must act with a full sense of responsibility for the probable consequences and not say that provided we have kept to our principles these may be ignored. So if the consequences of keeping a promise are likely as far as we can see to be quite disastrous we may feel justified in breaking it. Or, if we do keep it, we must be prepared to take full responsibility for the consequences and not say that our responsibility ends with "doing right" and leaving the rest to take care of itself. Whether we should ever break a principle in order to achieve a great good, and not only to avoid a great evil is more debatable but I do not doubt myself that there are circumstances where we should.

So in moral action our duty is to do what we decide is the best course open to us in the situation after we have responsibly weighed up the principles involved and the probable consequences. This means principles cannot provide us with a text book guide to right action since in any given situation two or more principles may be involved and we have to decide their relative importance in that situation and also give responsible consideration to consequences.

The content of a Divine Purpose

What is the difference between this, which I take to be a general account of what we mean by our "duty", and "Christian moral action"? I take the difference not to consist in Christianity giving us a distinct set of principles conveniently ordered in an invariable scale, nor in telling us to act without regard to consequences (though both these views have been maintained) but in looking on our action as taking place within the context of a Divine Purpose in which God is the "First and the Last". This is how I should try to express what others might prefer to call "obedience to the Word of God". I find difficulties in the latter way of putting it in so far as it suggests that we act under a sort of dictated guidance or can simply apply texts from the Bible to our moral situations. I do not believe we are just given clear unequivocal commands as to what we should do, although there may be and are cases where conviction is so strong that it feels like this. It may also be that some text or passage of the Bible

comes to us as particularly illuminating the issues in some moral situation, but I do not believe that the expectation that this will necessarily be the case is what is meant by acting under the Word of God. I believe rather that this means that our understanding of Scripture as a whole supplies the setting in which decisions, which are still our own decisions, are made. Nothing relieves us from the responsibility of making our own decision as to what we ought to do, and this, just because it is our decision, must be an act of faith, and we may in the light of fuller knowledge come to see that we were in fact mistaken. But we believe that the initiative, the call to make the decision, is from God the "First"; and we also believe in God as the "Last", alone able to see the situation and our action as it is, in His judgment and mercy. "Obedience" means that although we must make our own decision, we act in the recognition that the purpose we would fulfil is not our own but God's.

How do we know the will of God?

But—how do we know what the will of God really is? And here I gratefully recall Father Kelly's answer when asked this question at a Swanwick conference: "That's the giddy joke. We don't." God's purpose is for us largely a hidden purpose and the end of our action is something which He alone sees. But here the moral authority of the Bible comes in. We believe that something of the character of God's purpose has been shown in God's dealings with Israel as told in the Old Testament; that more is shown in the New Testament; and more again has been learnt through Christian experience reflecting on these. And this tells us that Justice and Mercy and Truth are within God's purpose. This is not to say that Justice and Mercy and Truth as we know them are the absolute Justice and Mercy and Truth of God, but that they are ways in which something of God's purpose meets us. So our moral decision is our own best judgment of what we should do, but a judgment formed and vitalised by our living as near as we can to God's Justice and Mercy and Truth as we learn of them in the Bible.

So I doubt whether it is right to speak of intuitive acts done in faith in response to what we believe to be God's call, as Kierkegaard does in *Fear and Trembling,* as "Theleological suspensions of the ethical". (This isn't Kierkegaard's last word about the "ethical". He has other and profound things to say about it in the *Unscientific Postscript.* But it is this saying which

has gained the wider currency.) This misunderstanding has arisen from identifying moral action with action which follows rigidly from principles, and from a failure to see that while concrete demands to act intuitively in faith may take us beyond general principles, they do not necessarily take us "beyond Good and Evil" though they may well take us beyond current ideas of goodness. This is the difference between the act of faith of a Christian who feels himself called to act in a way that goes against generally accepted principle and, say, an act of "Hitler's intuition". Hitler may and indeed does, speak of acting in response to an inner urge which he interprets as the voice of Providence. But it is a Providence thought of in non-moral terms, or as calling for a "transvaluation of values", (to use Nietzsche's phrase). But Christian moral action, however intuitive or revolutionary, is done in response to a God whom we have learnt from the Bible to be a God who cares for Justice and Mercy and Truth; and we acknowledge this even in acts in which we break a principle which is the generally recognised form in which we show our regard for these values.

Acting for a purpose beyond us

This may be illustrated from people's experience as to the ways in which they have found themselves impelled to act in the War and still more in the underground resistance movements. They find themselves in situations where if they are to resist at all (and they have accepted the call to resist as a moral call) they will have to do all sorts of things not only against the generally accepted legal code, but against their personal moral code. They may have to tell lies, forge papers to save a life, hide foodstuffs, and the like. The only alternative, besides that of collaboration with the enemy, is to stick to principles through passive non-co-operation, but this is to forego the call to active resistance which we may have judged to be the paramount moral call. What is to save us when we have entered on this road from finding that it is a slippery slope ending in a morass of complete moral relativity? Only I believe, firstly, a very strong sense that the decision by which we have entered on this course has been a responsible personal moral decision. And, secondly, that we are acting to fulfil not our own purpose but God's. But note that this does *not* mean that we can do unscrupulous things because we identify a purpose that we can see with the purpose of God. That way lies fanaticism, and history contains sad records of

the cruelty that has been wrought by people acting like this. It means that we are conscious of God's purpose as above and beyond us and if our own acts as arising from the way it has come home to us in our concrete response to justice and mercy and truth in conflict with evil. If our decision as to our duty in this struggle leads to breaking principles, e.g., telling lies, we cannot do so with complacency. We have to "turn a great many hairs" and care about these principles even when we break them. For we look on them as generalisations as to the kind of acts which uphold respect for the intuitive values on which they are based (that we should tell the truth is based in the end not on expediency but on a perception of truth as a value). Plato may have had something like this in mind when he spoke of the "lie in the soul" as mattering more than the spoken lie. It may seem paradoxical to say that people should forge papers out of loyalty to justice, but those who take risks to hide others from the Gestapo will know what this means.

Principles, as such, are then not our ultimate authority, but when we break them we should only do so "in fear and trembling" (to use another phrase of Kierkegaard's) acknowledging the value from which they spring. We also must recognise that we break principles at our peril, since they maintain the general respect for these values, and when this social recognition is weakened it cannot easily be recovered. It may only be recovered at all thanks to a sensitivity of conscience and tension of mind in those whose response to justice and truth is carrying them into situations where they have to deceive and lie, or else contract out of the struggle. Those who can act in this spirit (and it is admittedly playing with fire) may not be letting down morality; they may in fact be discovering its real sanctions behind code and custom, and so making possible a renewal of moral principles. These principles may not take just the form they have taken in the past; but if we are acting in response to our faith in the God of the Bible, I do not believe that we shall come to a "transvaluation of values". For we are not acting in response to a God who is "beyond Good and Evil" but to a God of righteousness and truth. Our formulation of principles may take different forms in the pattern of new social and historical circumstance, but if we are true to our roots, they will still be expressions of a regard for justice and mercy and truth.

Faith in the God of history

Hence we are not advocating a "teleological suspension of the ethical"—putting moral ideas into cold storage for the duration. And this, I should say, also applies in political action. It should not just be a Machiavellian affair of expediency, nor can it just be a simple matter of applying principles. We must not waive principle for expediency, but see that the antithesis between principle and expediency does not go deep enough. For if we believe that God, as we know Him in the Bible, is the God of *history* we cannot look on the circumstances in which we act as something extraneous and irrelevant. The circumstances also are part of the "data" given us from God and we have to find the fitting thing to do in that actual situation. We cannot even speak of the "Imitation of Christ" as a copying or repetition of acts done in different circumstances. We have to find a way of acting integral to our own circumstances here and now.

Hence I should find the distinctive element in Christian moral action to be *faith in God.* There is, it is true, an element of faith in all ethical action in so far as we do not look on duty just in terms of applying rules but as the call to do the most fitting act in each situation. There is thus no text book for any genuine ethical action and no way of evading the responsibility of weighing all considerations and making the best decision we can. But Christian moral action is distinguished by its faith being faith in a God of whose righteous purpose we have learnt through the Bible. So our moral judgment is energised and vitalised, perhaps sometimes inspired, through our putting ourselves in the hands of this God. We cannot see His purpose as a whole, and therefore the ends of our actions are known only to Him. We know that we cannot contract out of the sinful situation of the world for which we share responsibility, and therefore we cannot claim abstract perfection for anything that we do. But we are saved from over-anxiety because we believe that we are justified in the end by faith in God, and not by the perfection of our acts. We may see new meaning in Luther's saying *"Pecca fortiter sed fortius fide"*—"Sin courageously but trust in God still more courageously." But if our trust is in a God of righteousness and truth, we shall not depreciate morality, but acknowledge a moral demand which is more and not less exacting than that which stops with the application of principles.

A Layman's Thoughts on Natural Law

Charles Jacques Beyer

"Our theologians present were all ready to deal with it (i.e. natural law) but the rest of us were just floundering. We recognise its importance as a subject for Federation study, and will probably come back to it again as we begin to see its implications more fully." (The Student World, Third Quarter, 1943, p. 221.)

Thus Helen Morton, in her personal report to Suzanne de Dietrich, speaks of our discussions of natural law at Poughkeepsie II. And so we are still confronted with the responsibility for a deeper study of natural law; a responsibility which we recognise, but which we did not originally ask for. At Poughkeepsie we accepted it, out of a feeling of respect for, and solidarity with, those who first formulated it at Présinge. This is an attempt to make the terms of the problem a little clearer.

"Law", in the expression "natural law", really stands for "ethics" or "system of values"; it refers to a number of purposes and aims which are considered highly desirable to achieve and which we feel bound to pursue. The word "law" therefore does not essentially mean a law of a code, nor any kind of legal compulsion; it means a moral law which appeals only to our consent and good will to be put into effect.

The word "natural" is more difficult to explain. It does not refer to the laws that science discovers in nature. Rather is it concerned with human nature. It means a number of moral values which we can discover and recognise because of our human nature. Usually, a law has to be imposed on nature; it is not very "natural" to submit one's conduct to moral standards. Moral behaviour is something very artificial; so artificial in fact that it takes all the prestige of a religious revelation to make men conscious of those values and willing to abide by them. The idea of a "natural" law is that of a system of values which does not essentially belong to Christianity nor any other religion, but to human nature in general, and which does not need anything else but human thought to be understood and recognised.

Collaboration with non-Christians

As far as we Christians are concerned, the problem of natural law confronts us in the following ways. Firstly, the problems of the world are so urgent that we cannot wait to act until the whole world is officially converted to Christianity. We must therefore find a basis for collaboration with non-Christians. Secondly, God is not only our God, but the God of the whole world. His will is not only concerned with Christians and the Church, which has received His Revelation, but with the whole of humanity. We have therefore Christian obligations to the world outside the visible Church. (Cf. THE STUDENT WORLD, p. 219 on Prof. Hromadka's talk: "Every secular civilisation must reflect the majesty of God. So the Church sends her people into the world to organise law, education and all forms of social order.")

The great difficulty of the problem lies in the fact, demonstrated by Prof. Hromadka in his first Poughkeepsie talk, that natural law is not originally a Christian idea (although St. Paul seems to have it in mind in Romans 2: 14, 15). Our law is not given to us by our human mind, but by God; and it is not given to us just as men, but as souls redeemed by Jesus Christ. If we submit to a moral value, it is because that is God's will. How then can we, if God's will is the only basis of our action, find a basis of collaboration with non-Christians? Will not the result be that sort of lofty, inefficient idealism or secularised charity, that Michel Furfande analyses (THE STUDENT WORLD, p. 153), and, on the other hand, the degradation of the Christian ideal through our own inadequate actions—such as was achieved by French clericalism ("when clericalism gained ground, He gained nothing, and when clericalism lost ground, it was He Who was mocked", ibid., p. 158).

We therefore have strong and urgent reasons to find immediately a basis of common action with non-Christians, and equally strong reasons to avoid such collaboration as might dechristianise our charity and compromise Christianity by our failures.

Negative and positive reasons

Before attempting to solve this contradiction, let us make a few remarks. The reasons against working with non-Christians on a common basis of natural law are essentially negative (of

course) and theoretical; the reasons in favour of it are positive and practical. If the more theological "Mary" Christians try to understand the more practical "Martha" Christians (cf. THE STUDENT WORLD, p. 217), they will find that Christian collaboration with non-Christians already exists all through the world as a fact. The Chinese Christians are wholeheartedly supporting Chinese nationalism against Japanese and western imperialism; the Christians of India as well support the national aspirations of their people against exploitation from abroad; and our friends in West Africa also adhere to the ideal of an Africa freed from European exploitation. It seems to me quite characteristic of Poughkeepsie II that, while we were unable to extricate ourselves from the theological difficulties of natural law, we had all the time right among ourselves Chinese, Indian, and African Christians who were actually engaged in the pursuit of one "natural" or human value, namely national unity and independence. And we did not ask them how they were able to reconcile their Christian faith with such purely human ideals. In fact we did not at all question their Christianity. Is it because we of the "western" civilisation were all ashamed of ourselves and had guilty consciences? As I remember it, we all took it for granted that criticism of imperialism and exploitation was quite justified—so much so that it went without saying.

And so it happened that, while we had very refined theological scruples, we had no positive programme to match that of the Chinese, Indians and Africans. We were quite conscious of the fact that the present World Crisis was essentially our crisis. But we didn't know what we could do about it. Of course the Chinese had their solution, the Indians and Africans had theirs. But all we had was question-marks and difficulties: fear of doing something too secular, fear of doing something too imperfect, fear of doing the wrong thing, and that feeling of a guilty conscience—the feeling that while we could not agree on the "maximum" which Christian Law requires us to do, we have even failed to do that bare "minimum" which simple "natural" law requires every man to do. I remember our silence, when the question of the Russians was presented to us: "Where were you Christians, in Spain, in Abyssinia? What part did your Churches play?" (THE STUDENT WORLD, p. 218). Did not this silence imply that, in spite of our theological reasons, we did know what we should do, or should have done? that we knew about our failures?

The dangers of hesitation

If we now return to our dilemma, are there any values the pursuit of which we should share with non-Christians? It appears that even our hesitation is a responsibility, because it is inaction, because it permits the scandal of Spain, of Abyssinia, of colonial exploitation, etc., to pass unprotested. It is our silence which makes us the accomplices of any *status quo*. It must be pointed out therefore that active collaboration with non-Christians for a new world is not the only way, and probably not the most dangerous way, of secularising and compromising our Christianity. Our hesitations, our silence, constitute an efficient, though passive, collaboration with the existing order (or disorder), and therefore secularise and compromise Christianity no less.

It would seem therefore that, whatever we do, we collaborate on the basis of human values. Thus the question is not whether or not such collaboration should take place, but which are the human values that can be endorsed by Christianity, and how the unavoidable dangers of secularisation and compromise can best be met.

It may be that the Church as such should not take any part in politics in the modern world. It may be also that the Church will find it wiser to tell what is wrong rather than what is right. But even so, what many seem to expect from it is some definite guidance which may permit them, individually, to take their political stand in close and conscious connection with their Christian conscience.

Natural Law or Divine Law?

Some notes on the question[1]

W. A. Visser 't Hooft

I. *The immediacy of the problem*

We are in the midst of a renaissance of natural law. Theologians, jurists, leaders in state and Church, who are deeply disturbed by the practical and theoretical denial of the objective nature of law, by the systematic attack delivered against the most elementary rights of man, and by the powerlessness of the Church in face of this general anarchy, proclaim that we must return to the great tradition of natural law, which was taught under one form or another by the Church Fathers, the Scholastics, the Reformers and the Humanists. The only way to overcome the moral and legal relativism, which is leading us straight towards the abyss, is to revive the conception of law founded upon the law which God has inscribed in the hearts of men, and which, therefore, human reason is able to know of its own accord.

This is the refrain of all the more recent Papal encyclicals and of the writings of Catholic theologians. So the Dominican Fr. Cassian Weier (*Die Kirche Christi,* p. 197) tells us that all denial of natural law tends to make the orders of social and political life wholly relative and subjective. Jacques Maritain propounds the idea of a new charter of the rights of man on the basis of natural law.

Leaders of other churches are in agreement with them. Fr. Demant of the Anglican Church says (*Malvern,* p. 132) that, unless we return to the theology of natural law, society will deify natural and temporal order, and will elaborate pagan religions to act as a basis of its politics. The Archbishop of Canterbury says (*Malvern,* p. 12) that to dismiss natural theology means that the domain of the state is completely separated from that of the Church, and that the state is removed from all Christian influence.

[1] These are notes of talks given at a French S.C.M. senior members' conference in September, 1942. They were not intended as a formal article in The Student World.

Emil Brunner argues that the attitude with regard to natural theology is the nerve-centre of all Christian ethic (*Natur und Grade,* p. 37) and elaborates a Christian doctrine of natural law based on his exegsis of the thinking of the Reformers.

Finally, many Christians, preoccupied with the problem of collaboration between Christians and men of good will, who are not Christians, in the work of political and social reconstruction, express the conviction that only the acceptance by all of natural law as a common moral and philosophical basis will make the success of such collaboration possible.

II. *Law in the Bible*

1. In the Bible law is not conceived of as a horizontal relationship between men, but as the order which God wills to make regnant amongst men, and which He Himself creates. This order is therefore at the same time vertical and horizontal. God is the unique source of law. Law is not therefore based upon a general idea of justice or upon an immanent harmony, but upon the personal will of God, for "the judgment is God's" (Deuteronomy 1: 17). "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" (Genesis 18: 25; cf. Deut. 10: 28; 32: 4). And "Who taught him in the path of judgment?" (Isaiah 40: 14).

2. Law is therefore something given, a *grace* of God. It is not a matter of course that law reigns amongst men. Where man is not directed by the commandments of God, there disorder reigns (Isaiah 24: 5). We must therefore ask God to decree justice, to make law effective. Solomon prays that God will decree justice to His people (I Kings 8: 59). In the Psalms the oppressed beseech God to bring His law to pass.

Law, therefore, is not an order inscribed in the nature of man, which he can discover and realise by himself. It is only "when thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness" (Isaiah 26: 9). Those who are especially called to make law effective amongst men do not carry this out in their own name, but "in the name of the Lord". Thus Solomon asks God to give him a heart capable of judging the people of God (I Kings 3: 9). And this prayer "pleased the Lord".

3. There is, therefore, no human, natural or profane law. There is only the law of God. That is why law must not be broken or discussed, and is independent of the interests or passions of men. It is also the reason why the breaking of a law is a sin

against God Himself. It is the reason why law must be *revealed* to men.

4. The holiness of law, the necessary relationship between law and faith, is manifested in the fact that the covenant, by which God creates His people, is a covenant of law, a covenant of a people with the God Who is at the same time the Sovereign of law and the other party to the covenant.

It is equally significant that the fundamental word which the Old Testament uses to indicate law (*mishpat:* law, justice; in *plural:* commandments) and which first of all stands for "divine order" or the totality of the divine commandments, takes later the meaning of "compassion". For the justice which God renders to the poor, to the oppressed and exiled people of Israel, is the great proof of His faithful love.

5. Since law is the law of God Who judges the whole earth, it has a *universal* validity. Ezekiel (5: 6ff.) applies the law of God to all nations. The other prophets proclaim also that all nations are judged according to their obedience to the law of God (Isaiah 24: 1-6). For the time-being the other nations do not yet know this law, but the day will come when the righteousness of God will be revealed, as it has already been revealed to Israel. The Messiah, the Servant of the Lord, "shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles" (Isaiah 42: 1). He will establish the throne of David with judgment and with justice (Isaiah 9: 7). "Righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins" (Isaiah 11: 5). He "shall execute judgment and justice in the earth" (Jeremiah 23: 5). Then "a law shall proceed from one, and I will make my judgment to rest for a light of the people" (Isaiah 51: 4). Divine law is therefore destined to become the law of all nations, and it is in the name of this law that the nations are already judged.

A manifestation of the work of Jesus Christ

6. But if law belongs to the order of grace, and to the history of salvation this law is in the Old Testament, as in the New Testament, a manifestation of the work of Jesus Christ upon this earth. He, the just One, dies for the unjust (I Peter 3: 18). He has been made righteousness for us (I Cor. 1: 30). For He submits Himself entirely to the law of God; He reveals the fullness of this law, He carries the condemnation of our unrighteousness upon the Cross and is made the judge of all the earth. Thus the law

of God is truly revealed to *all* humanity and *all* the law of God is revealed to men. It becomes clear that the law of God demands not only a legal justice, but an obedience of the heart. It becomes clear also that no man is truly righteous before Him, and that our salvation depends upon the justification by which God wills to make us righteous. This justification is free by faith alone, a justification which releases us from the bondage of the law and enables us to live in the order of love.

7. But this is not to say that law has lost its rights upon the life of Christians. Those who are justified by faith do not cease to live in the kingdoms of this world, which are not the Kingdom of God, but belong to the order of this world. In this order law remains the great check upon the sins of men and creates the conditions of "peace" in which the Gospel can and must be preached to men. The justified do not despise, therefore, earthly justice, but show by their prayer and their action that they recognise this justice as a grace of God.

8. The Bible considers that the state is always and wholly bound by law. Solomon is established as King in order to govern according to law and justice (II Chron. 9: 8). In the book of Proverbs the King establishes the land by justice (29: 4). St. Paul teaches that the magistrate is the minister of God in the interest of justice (Romans 13: 4). The prophets condemn in the name of God all those Kings who govern according to their own good pleasure and substitute their arbitrary decisions for the law of God. And the psalmist prays "that the nations may know themselves to be but men" (Psalm 9: 21), that is to say that they may recognise their responsibility before the sovereign Judge.

9. So far as the content of law is concerned the detailed laws which were revealed to the people of Israel are no longer valid as laws. They are not valid for the Church, because the Church does not live under law. They are not valid for our peoples, because the people of Israel remain unique. At the same time these laws remain the great example of the way in which God legislates, and since the people of Israel represent not only a Church but a State, they help us to understand the character of the righteousness which God demands.

It is then the duty of Christians to study deeply the biblical conception of law, in order to discover in it the fundamental structure of the order which God wills to make regnant amongst men, and to confront actual laws with law according to the Bible.

10. Some important aspects of this biblical conception of law which we must rediscover and reaffirm are the following: primacy of law over the ideas and over the interests of the State; independence of law and of judges; primacy of human life over material objects; obligation to protect the weak and the poor; rights of foreigners; central place of the family.

11. We shall never extract a system of law from the Scriptures. The law of God is His concrete will which we must discover in each situation. But those who live by the Scriptures and are therefore constantly confronted by the action of God in history do not have their hands empty when they have to say what law is according to God. The commandments delivered once to the people of Israel, reaffirmed and re-interpreted by Jesus Christ give them sufficient indications to enable them to say what is truly law in a given situation, if all the time they submit their consciences personally to God Almighty.

III. Natural Law

1. The natural law of the *Stoics* is to a certain extent derived from nature (in the sense of causality), and therefore a sort of instinct, and to a certain extent a normative order, and therefore a moral criterion. For it is the immanent reason (pantheism) which proclaims the law and receives it at the same time. *"Non scripta sed nata lex"* (Cicero); that is to say it is inscribed in human nature. Positive law is nothing but the mirror of this eternal law, which alone has the final validity. Natural law expresses itself in *aequitas,* the criterion for the interpretation of all positive law. The accent is upon the law of the *individual* (*"homo sacra res homini"* said Epictetus) and on the *equality* of men, because men are reasonable beings (participating in reason) and independent. The State exists to protect individual rights. The powers of the state must be limited ("subjective" justice rather than the "objective" justice of a powerful community). The individual is an end in himself and the community becomes secondary. This stoic conception had an enormous influence upon Roman law.

2. The natural law of *scholasticism* is a mixture of stoic natural law with the divine law of the Bible in which the accent falls upon the former. The "bridge" consists in the conception of *imago Dei.* Human reason can discover unwritten law, for it is written "in the hidden depths of the heart of man" (Mari-

tain). This law arises "in an inevitable fashion" from the principle that man must do good and avoid evil. Belief in this law is stronger with those who know "its real principle", that is to say that it is "derived" from eternal and divine law. But in order to know that natural law is as real as physical laws it is *sufficient* to believe in human nature (Maritain). Grace therefore has no other function in this matter than to reaffirm and clarify that which exists already. Nevertheless the content of natural law is the love of God and of one's neighbour (*principia communissima*) and the Decalogue. (The Ten Commandments are necessarily valid, not because of the arbitrary will of God, but because of the result of the fundamental difference between good and evil.) The declaration of more precise principles is uncertain owing to the influence of the "passions" and of sin in the interpretation of rules. (This therefore is reserved for casuistry.) There are only two "plain" principles: to do justice and not injustice, and *"Suum cuique"* (Rommen). It is experience, rather than the Bible, which gives more precise indications.

3. The *Reformation* still used the formulas, "natural law" and "law of nature", but in fact it turned against the rationalism of scholastic natural law and above all *against* its stoic element. Nature is the *Ordo Dei* (*ordo a Deo prescriptus*). Man has a vague knowledge of this law, but, since the *basis* of justice (*praecipuum justitiae caput*) is obedience towards God and man's sinfulness, God has revealed His law to His people. Amongst other peoples moral truths are placed in a profane context. It is not a question therefore of adding revelation to a natural truth, but of making a new *beginning*. "Without the fear of God, there is neither equity nor love." The law of nature, therefore, is not a source of knowledge, but only a check upon total anarchy. (But at the same time the "moral" law of God is a manifestation of natural law "engraven" in the hearts of men—scholastic terminology.) Thus the whole accent is upon *lex scripta*. "The Lord has given us the written law that it may say to us more clearly what was too obscure in natural law." All law has its criterion in the great commandment. And *aequitas* is the application of the great commandment. It all flows from the law *of God to man*. Divine law is the guarantee of the objective order of justice rather than individual liberty (not egalitarian but corporative). The centre therefore is the glory of God, not the dignity of man. There exists a right of resistance, but that right must be exer-

cised by legal means and in the name of the community. (Critical of natural law but not breaking with it. Doctrine too little Christocentric.)

The Natural law of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries

4. "Modern" natural law is summed up in the phrase of Grotius that natural law would be valid *"etsi non daretur Deus"*. For Grotius law is not yet secularised, but the *accent* falls upon *reason* which God only confirms (*Jus naturale est dictamen rectae rationis . . . ac consequenter ab auctore Deo talem actum aut precipi aut vetari*), and his deductions are more on the rationalist side. The *pure rationalists* follow him, deducing whole systems from autonomous reason. There are opposing results, according to a first principle (which is always *in fact* supra-rational): egoism (Hobbes), *Socialitas* (Pufendorf), state of nature (Rousseau). While with Grotius and Hobbes natural law is still thought of primarily on the side of the community, since the time of Locke the individualistic interpretation has won the victory (rights of man). All oppose the dualism of Church and state. The state is only the result of individual wills, not an objective institution.

The result was chaos. There were as many "natural laws" as there were political attitudes. (Conservative and revolutionary natural law.) The reaction of the historic, or romantic, school was inevitable.

5. The "rights of man" of modern history have their origin partially in the juridical conception of the Reformation, but above all in the rationalist natural law of the seventeenth century. Zwingli and Calvin formulated prudently the right of resistance against tyranny (resistance *in the name* of a higher law and by duly constituted organs). This touches the doctrine of the state across the struggles of monarchy and through Althusius and through Grotius. Another line leads towards England: a) Hooker and Locke; b) Puritan independency (Roger Williams). Still these conceptions are always more secularised and in the eighteenth century in the *Virginia Bill of Rights* it is rather a question of individualistic and rationalist natural laws in the stoic manner than of organic laws anchored in the biblical revelation.

Thus natural law which won its great victories in the "rights of man" of the French Revolution and of the liberalism of the

nineteenth century is natural law in the most secularised form, the most rationalist, and the most individualistic. The great reaction against natural law thus became inevitable.

IV. The Present situation

1. The great fact which dominates the contemporary situation is that for the first time in the history of western civilisation great political systems and régimes deny—theoretically and practically—that there is a law above the will of the state, and that man has rights with regard to the state.

2. The denial of supra-human law is a reaction against natural law in its individualistic form (anti-liberalism, anti-rationalism, "liquidation of the French Revolution"). But it is at the same time and above all an insurrection of man against all divine order. While the French Revolution and the communist revolution turn against God but do not deny that there is an objective law and that man has a dignity and value apart from the state or the *volk,* Nazism turns not only against the divine revelation, but even against its repercussions, its reflections in the domain of the human.

3. But thus Nazism proves that natural law is not a *natural* law (*das natürliche Rechtsgefühl des deutschen Volkes*"). Nature by itself knows no other law than that of the stranger. There does not exist any *immanent* criterion to which all can make appeal. And if we find in certain pre-Christian civilisations (e.g., Rome, China) a recognition of the rights of man and of the sacred character of law, that must be considered as a grace of God, which is not given to *post*-Christian and therefore "hardened" peoples and civilisations.

4. So far as the rationalist natural law of stoicism or the eighteenth century is concerned, this law has lost its force since humanism—that is to say the movement of thought which in our modern world represents the stoic tradition—is the great loser of our epoch. Its individualism, its rationalism have made it incapable of holding firm at the moment of the great landslide.

5. To proclaim at the moment of the great insurrection against supra-human law the solution of compromise which is that of Christian natural law (scholastic—or non-Catholic forms), is to underestimate the adversary. In the present struggle the appeal to human reason is powerless, for it is precisely this

reason which has lost its orientation. With regard to human arbitrariness appeal must be made to the reality of a law willed by the Living God. The true struggle is that of divine law against human arbitrariness. In total anarchy we must attach ourselves to the commandments of God. It is not a question then of hastening "the eternal return of natural law", but of coming back again to what the Word of God teaches us on the subject of divine law.

V. Some Conclusions

1. Natural law means: a) Giving an unshakable basis to law, basing law upon permanent principles, withdrawing it from historical contingencies and the arbitrariness of human decisions, demonstrating the indissoluble bond between law and morality, b) Creating common ground between all men of every religion and ideology, a common tribunal to which all can make appeal.

2. But natural law fails in fact because: a) It bases itself upon "man considered in himself, therefore upon independent man, *autonomous,* man who has not been illuminated by revelation. Thus it is forced to elaborate a *rationalist* anthropology (reason capable *by itself* of discovering the principles of law) and to elaborate an abstract system. The result is that natural law (inasmuch as it does not live by revelation) becomes an arbitrary construction in which rights are simply the expression of subjective attitudes and a happy hunting-ground of all the ideologists.

b) It does not truly succeed in creating the common ground for all men, for human reason, being essentially an instrument and not creative, organises objects which have come from other sources, and is incapable by itself of mastering the anarchy of diverse ends and divergent passions.

3. The great preoccupation of the partisans of natural law is the safeguarding of the permanence of law and its general validity. But this end will never be reached by founding law upon the shifting sand of the changing conceptions of human reason. The permanence and validity of law do not reside in human qualities, but in the will of God and in His revelation.

4. The only unshakeable basis of law is therefore that of divine revelation. If our western civilisation has known a certain order, that is only thanks to what it has received from this revelation.

5. It appears therefore that there exists an untraversable abyss between natural law and law according to the Bible, and this is true theologically. Nevertheless since the Christian era all natural law has lived in fact by truths borrowed from revelation. The scholastics made a good pretence that natural law is founded upon reason, but introduced in fact revelation (the great commandment and the Ten Commandments) into their system. The framers of the rights of man borrowed their conception of the value of the human person unconsciously from Christian tradition. In so far as this biblical influence is present, and is not vitiated by heterogeneous elements, and the operative material criterion is biblical, the practical claims made by the one or the other do not differ in practice.

6. Christians who wish to live according to the Scriptures alone can and must proclaim the divine law and the juridical claim which flow from it, must denounce the false conceptions of law, primarily the totalitarian conception, must criticise from a theological point of view the theories of natural law, but also collaborate *practically* "ad hoc" (though continuing to proclaim that it is a matter of the will of God) with all those who defend the inviolable character of law and who defend the laws whose origin is biblical.

7. One could cite some examples of rights which ought thus to be defended and which we could and must defend in common with the adherents of natural law, and even with non-Christians, e.g., legal right against and in relation to the state; the right of the community to the service of each member; the right of equality before the law; the right of a man to sufficient compensation in exchange for his services; the right of the family; the right of the foreigner.

A Plea for a Christian Ethic

Donald Kennedy

C. N. Cochrane's recent book *Christianity and Classical Culture* should be read by every educated Christian. Shorter and far more readable than *Gone with the Wind*, its subject-matter is quite amazingly modern. Between classical culture and the modern humane culture of the west, now everywhere menaced by Nazi irrationalism, there is more than an analogy; there is a direct line of historical connection and descent. A perusal of current British literature on the "new order" makes this clear. E. H. Carr and William Paton, C. H. Waddington and *Picture Post*—all are deeply in its debt, as far as fundamental moral and cultural assumptions are concerned; and these assumptions also underlie the writings of thinkers belonging to other nations within the common European polity, so far as these are vocal.

The question arises: are these assumptions in harmony, or in conflict, with fundamental *Christian* truth? Basic to them all is the emphasis on justice, or law, as the cement of the new order. We are reminded of the impressive medieval synthesis: justice as the substratum, the foundation of culture, with religious love or compassion building on this foundation, its task beginning where that of justice ends.

The failure of the Reformers

Now, this "two-storied" conception of social ethics depended, in its turn, on a "two-storied" outlook on theology whereby the writ of the distinctively biblical notion of God—as living, personal Will—only began to operate where the jurisdiction of the abstract reason ceased. The Reformation exploded this outlook, attempting to ground all things "visible and invisible" on the Word of God, dynamic and Incarnate. In the doctrinal outlook of a large part of Christendom, they succeeded. But the question must be pressed: why did their work of "demolition" and "rebuilding" not extend to conduct, to ethics? It is our contention that it ought to have done so, and that a genuine Christian ethic, like a genuine Christian theology, must be "one-storied", in the sense indicated above.

The Reformers were hampered in their work by their "fundamentalism", i.e., they did not discriminate sufficiently clearly between the Incarnate Word and the written word, or indicate which was to be adored and obeyed as final truth. A sort of dualism resulted, the Incarnate Word becoming normative for faith, and written word for conduct. It would be not unfair to say that the Reformers merely rearranged the furniture on the ground-floor of the house of ethics, substituting for the classical conception of "justice" the Old Testament conception of the Divine "wrath" and "righteousness".

The results have been disastrous. As always happens when two principles are asserted as theoretically of equal importance, the weakest goes to the wall. "Ye *cannot* serve God and mammon"—in modern language, it is a psychological impossibility. Religious liberals, often accused of a sentimental appraisal of human nature have, at any rate, been realistic enough to note that, given a choice between a divine principle of action ("love" or compassion) and a human principle (classical "justice", Hebrew "righteousness"), the sinful heart of man, with its inherent will-to-power, will deify the human principle and give but a verbal allegiance to the divine. The divine, says the realist, begins where—if ever—the human breaks off. But, in fact, the human self-deifying principle *never* breaks off; its pretentions are essentially totalitarian and paranoiac.

No. We have not begged the question. We quite realise that, *subjectively,* justice and righteousness are, to their devotees, no less divine than the specifically biblical tradition. For them, therefore there can be no question of sinful idolatry or compromise. What every Christian has the right to probe and query is the coherence of these views with objective Christian truth. The unity of truth and the status of the Lord Jesus Christ, as being, according to the main stream of Christian testimony, the One Mediator as of salvation so of truth, seem to some of us to be at stake in this discussion.

The devotees of justice, (mainly Roman Catholics or Anglicans?), may be respectfully referred to the impressive thesis of Dr. Cochrane, in the work referred to above, that between the classical tradition and the Christian there is an *irreducible,* inescapable, conflict. As for the devotees of righteousness (mainly Lutheran or Reformed?), we must in all candour enquire: are they "fundamentalists" or not? If, through a doctrinaire, an almost neurotic reaction from 19th century

"Liberalism", this School now repudiates the doctrine of God's *progressive* self-disclosure in the Bible, culminating in Our Lord, how do they propose to rebut the charge of polytheism: i.e., of setting up the Old Testament as a revelation and incarnation of the eternal *alternative* to Jesus Christ?

Jesus Christ, as the Incarnate Word of God is the Mediator to man not only of Divine Salvation, but of Divine Wisdom also. The great evangelical thinkers, from Luther to Barth, impress us by their "Christological concentration" in the realm of personal religion. The time has surely come for a similar concentration in the realm of social ethics.

A critique of "neo-orthodoxy"

The convictions opposed to such an undertaking deserve analysis.

1. There is, first, the anti-liberal polemic associated with such names as Niebuhr and D. R. Davies. Our complaint here is simply that it does not go nearly far enough! The Liberalism attacked is of the obvious kind: humanist or sentimental pacifism, the doctrine of inevitable progress, the contemporary neglect of the problem of sin. But the more subtle humanism latent in the concept of "justice" is not dealt with. Is it not time for the Church to realise that the Devil is far too shrewd to concentrate on the heresies of yesterday? He ensconces himself comfortably in the heresies, the governing assumptions, of *to-morrow*. This is a principle of quite fundamental importance, needing to be most carefully noted. Failure to realise its far-reaching significance has, time and time again, proved a serious obstacle to the Church's mission among men. Pre-eminent among the heresies of to-morrow is the notion of justice.

2. A second, and very powerful, factor in contemporary thought is the tendency to soft-pedal everything in the Bible, and especially in the teaching of Jesus Christ, except the "apocalyptic" element. Here again one is justified in pointing out a curious perversity of thought. Broadly speaking, there are, in the Old Testament, two elements relevant to this discussion: (a) the moral, social, prophetic element: "Thus saith the Lord", "Thou shalt"; (b) the pessimistic "apocalyptic" element: The end of the world is near; (therefore) be passive. Let us be quite clear about it, these two elements are equally authoritative, as far as the Old Testament is concerned. To dismiss the first with

a wave of the hand, as "mere 19th century humanism" is most unscholarly, inaccurate and unfair. Why then is the second, the apocalyptic, element so stressed to-day? Does it not almost seem as if it is valued just because it is strange, bizarre, irrational? Does not the neurotic element in much neo-orthodox thought, its "failure of nerve", here receive further documentation?

D. R. Davies' *Down, Peacock Feathers* deserves close study in these connections. One cannot but be impressed by the searching analysis, the "sociological" statement of original sin. It is worthy of the prophetic tradition at its best. But when we brace ourselves to pass from diagnosis to prescription, when we enquire: "So what?", we are disappointed. The prophet having cried: "Repent" becomes incoherent with a fit of coughing, choked with a bath-bun. The "apocalyptic" strain has reasserted its fatal soporific power.

In this socially-minded age, any valid "supernaturalism" must be balanced by a healthy "humanism". Most Christians are agreed on this. But *how* are the two to be related? The paradox here is that the would-be "orthodox" supernaturalist is not ashamed to enter into unholy alliance with notions like "justice" and "righteousness", which, as we have tried to show, are either pagan or "fundamentalist" in origin; while the so-called "liberal" is often contending, whether he realises it or not, for a high Christology—an extension to the realms of conduct and social ethics of the brilliant generalisations of the Nicene theology.[1]

The true place of the teaching of Christ

Jesus Christ is no mere teacher; nor is He to be dismissed as the focus of a glorified mystery religion. (This is the ultimate logic of apocalyptic irrationalism.) God of God, Light of Light, He embodies *the* Law of God, as well as *the* Salvation of God, Law and Salvation as God understands them. Note the definite article, *the* Law: not "Law" which, like "Salvation", may mean anything or nothing. The Law, focussed in St. Matthew's Gospel but attested also in the other Gospels and the Epistles, is integral to the Gospel. What the Christ Himself is to the old dispensation in general this Law is to the ethics of the Old Testament. To

[1]Reference may be made to John Macmurray's *The Clue to History*; to G. H. C. Macgregor's *The Relevance of the Impossible* (first part); and to the essay by H. H. Farmer in the symposium, *This War and Christian Ethics.*

the great evangelical principle, "Justification by Faith", it stands in a dialectical relationship, so that this great principle must never be used as an excuse for evading God's concrete demands. The early Church, like the "younger" Churches of today, grasped this clearly, especially in the content of its teaching to new converts.[1]

What is needed is a renewed study of the evangelical, social and moral teaching of the prophets, together with its God-given climax in the compassionate agape of God, demanded of us in Epistles and Gospels alike as an integrating principle of *human* action. Along with this will go a shrewd appraisal of the "law and order" principle, underwritten by the neo-orthodox school of Christian writers, along the lines indicated above. To enthrone the teaching of Jesus Christ as an integral part of His Incarnation, and therefore as binding on His Church, is not to minimise sin, to soft-pedal the Divine righteousness, or even to suppress the true meaning of apocalyptic. Sin is engrained in the law and the *mores* of even civilised nations; therefore the "new order" of revived classicism will not be the Kingdom of God. Nor will *its* law be *His* law. The Divine righteousness is best thought of as immanent in historical events (see C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle to the Romans*). Our realists will still have their function but in a Christian ethic it will be marginal, (formulating the incidence of human sin), rather than normative, (attempting to water down the "offensive" demands of God). As for our apocalyptists let them prick the bubbles of the *new* order, instead of dragging intellectual dead horses into the ecclesiastical arena and going to the trouble of flogging them there.

Original sin is not the central dogma of our faith. That place of honour belongs to Jesus Christ made Very Man for our Salvation and crucified by human piety and human justice.

[1]Cf. Philip Carrington: *The Primitive Christian Catechism.*

The Biblical Basis of Law

A Bible Study prepared by Suzanne de Dietrich

Legal Language

It is impossible to read the Bible carefully without being struck by the important place given to legal ideas. Questions of justice, right, law, and contract constantly occur. Are we to say that this legal language is used here simply in a metaphorical sense, presenting convenient illustrations of relationships which are actually of an entirely different kind? This is partially true, but only partially. Undoubtedly this legal language interprets truths of a theological or ethical order, which pass beyond the strict limits of law. But it is none the less significant that the Bible prefers to use this language. The Bible is aware of a divine order, a law of God, which dominates and regulates the relationships of God with men, and of men with one another. This is the case, because the God of the Bible is not an abstract entity, but the living God, Who maintains with men personal and living relationships. When we use the term personal relationships we mean obligation and responsibility.

But since we are dealing here with a very special relationship, a relationship in which one of the contracting parties is God Himself, and in which it is the nature of divine action which determines the human response, and controls not only the relationship of God with men, but of men with one another, we must pay close attention to the terms employed. The same term is sometimes used with different meanings in the Bible itself; more than that, it is almost always burdened with a theological or ethical meaning, which it does not possess in secular terminology. The first problem therefore, will be in the sphere of etymology; it will be to attempt to define briefly the meaning of certain essential terms, and their evolution in the course of the centuries.

Definition of biblical terms

(a) *Law.* The Hebrew word *torah* (Greek *nomos;* French *loi*) in the Old Testament does not only mean the written law, the Mosaic legislation. The Hebrews gave the name of *torah* to

the first five books of the Bible, because they contained the revelation of the Will of God, and of His guidance to His people. This revelation manifests itself in actions, and is then interpreted in commandments. These commandments are inseparable from Him Who gives them; it is from Him that they derive their authority and their coercive power. When Jesus speaks of the Law and the prophets He means the total range of the Scriptures, that is to say the divine revelation as contained in the Old Testament.

In the Judaism of the synagogue the word law is used in a more limited and strictly legal sense. It embraces in this case the laws and customs which ruled in Israel, but their authority always resides in the fact that these laws were given by Moses at the command of God.

The Greek version of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, and the New Testament translate *torah* by the Greek word *nomos*. It is interesting to note that in the early days of ancient Greece the word *nomos* was beginning to be identified with the will of Zeus. In the sixth century before the Christian era *nomos* became a divine impersonal principle. The wisdom, which governed the universe, was also the wisdom which governed the life of society; human laws were a particular case of the divine laws which rule the universe. In the fifth century the divine authority of the *nomos* was shaken. "Human nature triumphs over law and becomes stronger than law." (Thucydides). The Sophists regard the divine origin of *nomos* as a fiction[1]. Since then some consider the laws as having their origin in an order of nature, while others regard them simply as the positive content of civic law.

If we are commenting on these facts, it is with the intention of noting where the evolution of modern secularism meets that of ancient Greece. We also in our day have secularised law. Nothing could be more foreign to the biblical notion of law.

(b) *Righteousness.* According to the biblical revelation it is God Who creates and sustains law. In order to understand this we must analyse another word which occurs constantly in the language of the Bible; namely righteousness,[2] (Green: *dikaiosune;* French: *justice*).

[1] See Kittel's Theological Dictionary, p. 1018.

[2] Readers should refer to the definition of *righteousness* in a good Bible dictionary. Translation on this point is difficult, because in the French language *justice* is used for both righteousness and justice. Ed.

In the Old Testament righteousness is not an abstract idea. We cannot even say it is an attribute of God. God is righteousness, and God creates righteousness. It is an act of God rather than a separate quality. We are in the presence of a reality which is not static but dynamic. God is the righteous God, Who judges the whole earth, and exercises judgment (Genesis 18: 25; Deuteronomy 32: 4; Isaiah 9: 6; Jeremiah 12: 1; 23: 5; Psalm 11: 7; 33: 4-5; 45: 5-8).

In the Judaism of the synagogue the term righteousness has a narrow sense. He is "righteous" who fulfils the works ordained by God, particularly almsgiving. Righteousness is contrasted with goodness.

In the New Testament the word righteousness sometimes has the meaning of judgment. In the Gospels righteousness means conduct which conforms to the will of God and which pleases Him —conduct which is right in His eyes (Matt. 3: 15; 5: 6; 5: 20; 6: 33). We are concerned here with the righteousness of God, the righteousness of the Kingdom, which is grace, given, and not deserved, with the righteousness Jesus came to fulfil. It is a life lived before God, and for His sake, under the sign of His Kingdom which is coming. St. John links righteousness and judgment explicitly to the person of Jesus Christ; it is in Him and by Him that we are justified or condemned (John 3: 16-21). For St. Paul the righteousness of God is the act by which He has justified us in Jesus Christ. He contrasts the Jewish idea of righteousness by works with righteousness by faith.

The essential thing to keep in mind is that in biblical language the righteousness of God is not an abstract virtue, but a divine *activity,* the act by which God condemns or justifies man. Here already a first conclusion emerges from this study: that the biblical conception of righteousness and law is radically *theocentric.*

The Bible recognises a law of God, a righteousness of God, and recognises no other. The commandments given in the Bible, whether religious or moral in the civil, penal, or ecclesiastical sense, are the concrete expression of the will of God for a given people and a given time. They derive all their authority from Him, Who ordains them, from Him Who is the righteous and Holy God (Leviticus 20: 7-8; 20: 26; 22: 31-33; Deuteronomy 6: 1-9, etc.). And they are given not to any people but to a people bound to God by a contract of a particular kind, by a "covenant".

This idea of covenant plays so fundamental a part in the history of salvation, and throws so strong a light for us on righteousness and law that we must stop a moment to consider it.

The Biblical idea of covenant

The Bible attaches great importance to the *contract,* to the given word and conversely it visits with severe punishments any breach of contract. For God Himself is the witness and guarantor of any covenant made, and the breach of it means not only offending the other party, but offending God and incurring His condemnation (Jeremiah 34: 8-22, notably v. 18).

If this is the case with contracts made between men it must be so *a fortiori* with covenants in which God is *one of the contracting parties.* A breach of covenant on man's part brings death in its train. But God is equally bound and involved, for God never goes back upon His word (Romans 11: 29). That is why the whole history of redemption shows us God inventing, if I may dare to use the word, new means of snatching man from the final consequences of his actions, that is, from actual death. From that moment love fulfils righteousness by substituting itself for the defaulting party.

In this way the Bible sets before us a series of "pacts" which it is worth our while to study more closely. Perhaps at the very beginning we might speak of a "pact of paradise". The book of Genesis opens with the vision of a world which is "good" because it is perfectly ordered to its end, namely God. Man is designed by God as the guardian of His creation; and there is a law of paradise which brings with it responsibilities and a prohibition.

As soon as man attempts to pass the limits of creaturehood the result is total destruction of the established order, chaos and death. This is the meaning of the story of the Fall. The story of the first murder (Genesis 4), the revolt of mankind described in Genesis 6 and 11 illustrate what one might call the natural state of man after the Fall. And his natural end is death.

If God were righteousness only in the human meaning of the word, He would leave the work of death to accomplish itself, and the flood would give a final ending to creation. But His compassion intervenes and protects Cain from the final consequences of his crime (Gen. 4: 15). Noah also it saves.

It is here that we meet for the first time the idea of covenant. God binds Himself to Noah by a solemn pact, and through Noah

to the *whole of humanity,* beyond that, to "all living creatures". God binds Himself not to destroy the world. The preservation of the world is an act of *the patience of God.* This promise of God is unconditional. It is not derived from the faithfulness of man; it has its basis in the faithfulness of God alone. God delivers two commandments. The first has to do with murder, since all men are brothers and every man must answer for his brother's blood. We must emphasise the universal character of these first commandments, and the fact that they deal essentially with *respect for life.*

The people of God

With chapter 12 of Genesis we reach the history of the people of God. God concludes with Abraham a solemn covenant. The rite described in Genesis 15: 9-11 was undoubtedly the current practice in ancient Israel (cf. Jeremiah 34: 18). When Abram passed between the divided pieces of the animals, he undertook to fulfil the contract concluded in this manner under penalty of being reduced himself to the same state as the victims offered up. Note that God alone (symbolised by the flames in verse 17) is said to have passed between the pieces of the animals.

The covenant of Sinai sets before us another solemn contract. Moses reads the book of the Law before the whole people; then he offers a whole burnt-offering, and pours half of the blood upon the altar, sprinkling the people with the other half. This is a covenant of blood, which establishes communion between God and His people (Exodus 24). It is important to emphasise that the covenant of Sinai is a covenant of grace. It is not God the creator who here reveals His law to Israel, but in very truth it is God the *Saviour.* The Ten Commandments (Exodus 20) open with the words: "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me." God has snatched His people from death. He once more reveals to them the *order* without which they could only perish. This order has to do with the bearing of man before God as well as with his relationships to his fellows; it extends to the family, the clan, the stranger, the slave, and even to the beasts.

After the entrance into the Promised Land the Covenant of the people with their God is renewed at Shechem. And here too it takes the form of an actual legal contract (Joshua 24: 19-27). Joshua emphasises the fact that the promise is made in complete

freedom: "Ye are witnesses against yourselves that ye have chosen you the Lord, to serve him." And the people answer: "We are witnesses." After this Joshua raises up a stone which, he says, "shall be a witness unto us; for it hath heard all the words of the Lord, which he spake unto us." Israel has judges who dispense justice in the name of God (Exodus 18: 13-26; Judges 4: 4-5; I Samuel 7: 15-17). But the true judge of Israel is God Himself; it is this which underlies the practice of judging by lot (Numbers 26: 55).

Every violation of law is a crime against God, a violation of the covenant made with Him. That is why the prophets frequently compare Israel to a prostitute, who has forsaken her first love and has broken her marriage-contract (Jeremiah 2 and 3; Hosea 2 and 3). Or again they show us God at issue with His people (Hosea 4: 1; Isaiah 1: 18, 41ff.; Amos 1-3, etc.). God becomes accuser and defender in turn. For He will never abandon His people and His punishments have as their final aim their salvation (Hosea 11: 1-9). That is why His judgments always end in a new promise of deliverance; and this promise is linked in the prophetic message with the coming of one who shall "execute judgment and righteousness" (Jeremiah 33: 14-16, cf. Isaiah 11: 5; 42: 1, etc.), with the new covenant, which is written in the heart.

The New Covenant

The mystery of the New Testament is that Jesus Christ substitutes Himself for the defaulting party, to fulfil the engagement into which the latter has entered. In Jesus Christ it is God Himself Who is substituted for man; thus His compassion fulfils the demands of His justice. By His perfect obedience Jesus accomplishes the divine will (Hebrews 10: 8-16) and breaks the chains of sin and death; He makes possible the new covenant of which He is the agent and the guarantor, the covenant which is written in the heart. The divine idea of justice here upsets all our human ideas of equity. On the human plane we cannot conceive of a legal substitution which will permit the innocent to redeem the guilty. On the divine plane, where justice and love are co-operative and creative forces, such a substitution is the very essence of love. And indeed it fulfils justice; sin is condemned, and its fruit, death, is destroyed. Jesus Christ creates new men, righteous in God's sight. Divine righteousness working in Him and through

Him is revealed as *power that justifies.* The contract concluded with Abraham binds God, according to St. Paul, to the end of time. Once Jews and Gentiles have entered into the covenant of grace God will be all in all, and righteousness shall reign.

Divine Righteousness and law

Is not this biblical idea of a righteousness which justifies so radically different from legal ideas of justice and law that there is no transition possible from the one to the other? This is indeed the heart of the question, and we admit its difficulty.

The righteousness of God, of which the New Testament speaks, is an eschatological reality. It will be manifested in its fulness at the end of time. The Bible proclaims to us: "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (II Peter 3: 13). The nature of this righteousness is described to us in an admirably realistic manner by the prophets, notably Isaiah (Chap. 11; 65: 17-25, etc.).

We might multiply quotations. They reveal a world ordered by God, that millennium of peace, justice and harmonious living of which mankind has always dreamed. But for the Bible this millennium is no dream; it is not the work of men, or the result of human progress. It is the work the Lord's Anointed, of Whom the whole Old Testament speaks, and Whose name the New Testament reveals to us, Jesus Christ, the Crucified, and Risen Lord. "And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins." (Isaiah 11: 5.)

Through the fact of the Incarnation this righteousness has ceased to be purely and simply a reality from another world. We see an earnest of this in the earthly activity of Jesus. This righteousness works like leaven among those who belong to Him, and in the Church which is His Body. Jesus speaks of this righteousness again when He says to His disciples: "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt 5: 20). In the name of this righteousness He proclaims the principles of the Sermon on the Mount, absolves the repentant publican, and condemns the Pharisee established in the righteousness of works.

The Gospels and the Epistles set before us an ethic, which is already in the fulness of its demands the *ethic of the Kingdom.* This is an ethic the truth and continued existence of which

depends upon Christ and upon Him alone; it is the work of the Holy Spirit in a society, which lives under the sign of the Risen Lord; it can only exist in us as the fruit of *His righteousness.*

The function of the Church

The Church is called at the same time to *announce* and to *show forth* this righteousness.

1) To announce it, because the Church knows that the Risen Christ by His elevation to the right hand of God the Father has been established as Lord of the whole creation, and that He will return to judge the earth. This means that from henceforth He is judge not only of the Church which acknowledges Him, but of the world which knows Him not.

2) To show it forth, because the Church as the Body of Christ, and the fellowship of believers, must allow itself to be ruled by this righteousness and not by the standards of the world.

From these two statements certain consequences seem to me to follow:

1) The Church cannot acknowledge any autonomous law, which does not have its basis and its end in God. The Church knows that as soon as any realm of human activity, whatever it be, is withdrawn from the divine authority, and detached from its source and its end, it is doomed to chaos and destruction. Further the Church knows that the redemptive work of Christ embraces the whole of creation, and the whole field of human activity, not excepting law. Therefore the Church must preach the *righteousness of God* and remind legislators as well as magistrates, magistrates as well as heads of the State, that there is a Sovereign Lord to Whom they must give account of the manner in which they have set forth and applied His law, and established its supremacy.

2) The Church knows that divine righteousness revealed in Jesus Christ, alone is efficacious and operative, for it alone makes a man righteous. All that human justice can do is to limit the wrong men do to one another by coercive measures. But this human justice reflects, or at least may reflect, something of divine righteousness. Perishable, temporary, and fragmentary though it be, it must be forever tending towards the fulfilment of a higher will. And so the Church must enlighten those, who are charged with the establishing and applying law, as to what God reveals to it in His Word regarding man's end on earth, the relationships

between man and man which God in His Providence has willed, and the social order. Taking its stand on what is given in the Bible, the Church cannot create in every respect a law which will be valid for all times, but it can in every age examine, criticise, and correct the existing law in the light of His Word.

3) Finally and above all, the Church must manifest within its own life, in so far as it itself is an organised body with Jesus Christ as Head, a law conforming to the will of God, as revealed to us in Christ. The Church is called to live under the sign of the Risen Lord, is governed by the Holy Spirit, and possesses here below the promises of the Kingdom. So the Church must *manifest* here below in its very existence another justice than that which rules in the world. The Sermon on the Mount and the Epistles give us the substance of an ethic of the Church, which is the "Law of the Kingdom".

The "righteousness" of Christians must take its inspiration from the Father Who makes the rain to fall on the just and on the unjust (Matt. 5: 45), Who pays the labourers of the eleventh hour as much as those of the first (Matt. 20), Who forgives the debts of the insolvent debtor (Matt. 18: 23-35). Those who have been forgiven by Christ, who are under the sign of His pardon, must on no account let themselves turn to pride, hardness of heart, and avarice; they must on no account have law suits between themselves, and take their case before pagan tribunals. However, the Bible is always realistic. If it condemns recourse to pagan tribunals, it also admits the necessity of ecclesiastical discipline, and sketches its first outlines (Matthew 18: 15-17, cf. 5: 23-26; I Corinthians 6: 1-9; II Corinthians 13: 1). But we have forsaken biblical teaching on this point; we have agreed to arrange our differences according to the standards, and before the tribunals, of this world. This fact is not only serious for individual Christians; it prevents the Church from witnessing by its own life to that which is a law illuminated by the light of revelation.

Biblical teaching concerning the content of Law

The Bible enlightens us concerning the will of God, His Righteousness and His Law in two ways: by *commandments* and by *judgments.*

a) The Old Testament sets before us a complete system of *legislation* in which ritual laws are mingled with civil laws. In

common with all positive law these precepts bear the mark of the time in which they were formulated. Many relate to a nomadic life and to a condition of life which is still primitive; many of them have nothing original about them, but recall the Babylonian legislation of the same period. The unique element in this legislation is not its content but, as we have seen, the authority on which it is based: "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me." It is the living God, Who is speaking, God the *Saviour:* Israel belongs to Him by right of election, and by right of redemption. When God reveals His will to Israel, He marks the boundaries, which it cannot cross without relapsing into disorder and death: "Behold, I set before you the way of life, and the way of death." This law is given within the covenant of grace which has just been concluded. This does not mean that the commandments thus formulated are valid only for Israel; but it does mean that they are binding in a peculiar fashion upon Israel, because it is the chosen people, the people which must be the witness of God among the nations (Amos 3: 1). God is the God of the whole earth; but He has chosen Israel from among the nations as the instrument of His revelation, and that is why He has given it His law (Exodus 19: 4-6).

The Mosaic legislation emphasises in the first place the law of God. The greatest sin is the sin of idolatry and this incurs the heaviest penalties. The rest on the seventh day, whatever its social consequences may be, refers back to what one might call commandments concerning the honour of God. It is followed immediately by the commandment concerning reverence for parents. Then come the commandments concerning murder, adultery, theft, false witness, covetousness. The Ten Commandments lay the ethical foundation of the formal code which follows, and which fixes sanctions.

We cannot here analyse this legislation. Let us be content with commenting upon a certain number of characteristics: reverence for father and mother (Exodus 20: 12; 21: 15-17); reverence for life, and the supremacy of life over material objects; protection of the weak, and particularly of the stranger, the widow, the orphan and the poor (Exodus 22: 21-27; 23: 6 and 9); integrity of the magistrate (Exodus 23: 7-8); limitation of the law of vengeance (cities of refuge, horns of the altar); rever-

ence for work, and right to rest, even of the earth (Leviticus 25: 8-24).

Jesus summed up the whole ancient law in one sole commandment: love of God and love of neighbour which to Him were *one and the same thing.* Man cannot love and honour the Creator without loving and honouring His creature, nor love his Father without loving his brothers (cf. I John 4: 20-21). Jesus emphasises that certain Mosaic laws must have been formulated because of "the hardness of our hearts", and are a concession to human weakness, not the final expression of divine righteousness. He says this expressly on the subject of marriage (Mark 10: 2-11, cf. Matt. 5: 27-38), He takes it for granted when He speaks of the law of retaliation, or making an oath (Matt. 5). Over against the "commandments of men" He sets the will of God in relation to honouring parents (Mark 7: 6-10). Human laws have power only over actions, but divine righteousness looks to the heart (Matt. 5, Mark 7). It is significant that to illustrate "who is my neighbour" Jesus chooses a Samaritan, who fulfils the law of God in behaving as a neighbour to the wounded man, whereas the priest and the Levite pass by (Luke 10: 25-37). This shows that a pagan may fulfil in certain points the law of God, when those who are recipients of the revelation violate it. (This in my opinion is also the meaning of the controversial passage in Matt. 25: 31-46.) Thus the whole attitude of Jesus tends to a recognition of the necessity of the written law, but also of its provisional, incomplete, and in some cases transitory, nature. It is a necessary curb on the injustice of men, but it can never be equal to the demands of divine righteousness. Still He never abolishes it even while transcending it, that is to say, while demanding not less but more than it demands.

Judgment in the Bible

b) The Bible sheds perhaps more light upon the content of law by the judgments pronounced on those who violate it, than by the positive laws which it contains.

We know the place given by the prophets to *social justice.* Violence and spoliation practised by the great ones of the earth, venality of magistrates, moral confusion are for them signs of the perdition of a nation. It is remarkable to see the place given in the Bible to the rights of the poor, and conversely the severity of its judgments upon the rich. And we must note that on this

point Jesus has taken up, and reinforced rather than weakened the teaching of prophets (Amos 2: 6-8; 5: 10-15; 8: 4-6; Micah 2: 1-5; Isaiah 5: 8-25, etc., cf. Luke 6: 20-25; 12: 16-21; 16: 19-31).

The prophets strongly emphasise that there is a law in relationships between nations, and that violence provokes and unchains violence. ("They that take the sword," said Jesus, "shall perish with the sword.") They condemn diplomatic intrigues and breaking of the given word. And, if they condemn Israel's alliances with heathen nations for a religious motive (Isaiah 30: 1-5; 31: 1-6), their condemnation extends to all the heathen nations, which are addicted to cruelty, or blinded by their pride and spirit of domination, so that they do not see themselves as mere instruments of a higher will (Isaiah 10: 5-19; 14: 11-20; 47; Jeremiah 25 and 46-51).

All nations enter into judgment with God and appear before His throne (Amos 1-3; Isaiah 43: 9; Jeremiah 25). This presupposes that they have some knowledge, however limited, of good and evil, justice and injustice. The Bible knows the degrees of darkness in the conscience of the heathen; it does not put on the same plane a Cyrus (Isaiah 45) and a Nebuchadrezzar (Jeremiah 25). But, as the central focus of the Bible is the history of salvation, the crimes of the heathen, or on the other hand, their faith, are only quoted in order to set in relief the free grace of God, or the blindness of Israel.

The violations of law with which the heathen are reproached are often among those which were commonly condemned by the peoples of antiquity: breaking one's word, cruelty in reprisals, disturbing of graves, etc. (Amos 1-3). We have here a common pool of precepts and customs which God recognises as conforming to His law by the sanctions which He applies to their violation.

The deification of the State

In a series of cases the judgment of the Bible is brought to bear upon the deification of the state.

When we study the great pagan civilisations we observe that the deification of the monarch is the form of idolatry to which they naturally, and almost inevitably, tend as soon as they reach the pinnacle of their power. Man's pride always leads him to take himself as norm and as end. The Bible knows this and emphasises it from its first page to its last, from Genesis to Revela-

tion. When God's sovereignty is disowned, man makes himself God; from that moment he erects himself as supreme arbiter of good and evil, *as arbiter of law*. He knows no law but his own: "Because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a God, I sit on the seat of God, in the midst of the seas; yet thou art a man, and not God, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God." (Ezekiel 28: 2.)

The prophecies of Ezekiel on the prince of Tyre are among the most striking of the Old Testament. But the same theme occurs again in Isaiah 10: 12-15; 14: 13; 31: 3; in the book of Daniel (Chap. 3 and 6); II Maccabees 15: 1-6; and finally in Revelation 13. For the beast of the Apocalypse does seem to be the deified state. "And he causeth . . . that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." The régime of "the beast" could not be more clearly characterised as the abolition of all law. We are here in the presence of the extreme case of the demonic state.

The State as guardian of the law

These extreme cases which we have just mentioned are a negative demonstration of the true function of the state. It is the *guardian of law*. Whenever it sets itself up as sovereign arbiter of law, or usurps a role which belongs to God alone, the inevitable result is arbitrariness and chaos.

We cannot deal fully with the problem of the state, but we must say a few words on the subject. In the Old Testament Israel has in its character of chosen people the qualities of both Church and nation. Israel is a theocracy with God as sovereign; the King governs, the magistrate judges in the name of God, and is nothing but the representative of the greater than himself. The Book of Kings emphasises this fact in a recorded formula, when it describes a reign in these simple words: "Such and such a King did right" or another King "did evil in the eyes of God". The prayer of Solomon reveals the mission of the wise king: "Give therefore thy servant an understanding heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and bad; for who is able to judge this thy so great a people?"

The prophets stand up before the kings and leaders of the people as defenders of the outraged law of God. Remember Nathan before David, Elijah before Ahab, the warnings given by an Isaiah, an Amos, a Jeremiah and so many others to the kings

of their day (cf. Jeremiah 22: 24-30; 36). These are scenes of arresting power in which the prophet reminds the king that his pleasure can never be law, and that he will be called to answer for his actions before God.

With the New Testament we find ourselves in a wholly different situation, since here both Jews and Christians are set under pagan authorities. It is therefore all the more striking that St. Paul still considers these authorities as guardians of the law, and as possessing this mandate from God Himself. Submission to the established power is therefore for the Christian an integral part of his submission to God (Romans 13: 1-7; I Timothy 2: 1-4; I Peter 2: 13-17). But the New Testament marks the bounds of this submission when it points out that it is better to obey God rather than men (Acts 5: 29, cf. 4: 19), and when it prepares the faithful disciples for being dragged before tribunals and persecuted for their faith (Mark 13, cf. Revelation 20: 4).

Christian political responsibility

Let us observe in conclusion that the problem of the state faces us in a different form from that which it took either for ancient Israel or for the Christians of the first centuries. The modern European state has this in common with the pagan state that it is a secularised state; but it is none the less still penetrated by Christian traditions. So much the more does the modern Christian as a citizen share responsibility for the acts of his government. He has the right, and hence the duty, to work for the improvement of the laws, and to oppose such as in the light of the Word of God appear contrary to the will of God. Finally he can be watchful of their application.

If the Church has not to interfere as such in the region of legal technicalities, it can *work to train legal consciences enlightened by the Word of God.* More than that it must denounce manifest injustice; *for in the secularised state the Church is the guardian of the law of God.* The Church has a *prophetic role,* that of the watchman (Ezekiel 33). It must "warn the people" when they are on a dangerous road, but, if it fail to do so, "its blood will the Lord require of it."

Has the Church given warning? Is it not just because it has failed in this aspect of its mission that the Church today is passing through the fire of judgment?

Thinking Ahead as Christians

Some comments from national Student Christian Movements

The Officers of the W.S.C.F. have been calling together small consultative meetings in North America and Europe to discuss certain phases of life and opinion within the Federation. Out of these evolved the following four questions which the Officers circulated among the national movements:

1. What should be the future relationships of countries in Asia and Africa to the so-called western countries? What is the significance of "the four freedoms" in the total world situation?

2. How can constructive relationships between the U.S.S.R. and other nations be assured? What is the part of Christians in this matter?

3. What are the basic convictions about the nature of a future world order which Christians hold in common? How can we find these in our study of the Bible, and state them clearly?

4. What should be the function of the university in the post-war world? How can Christian individuals and movements within the university be related to this function?

Argentina, China, the United States and Uruguay have answered so far. The meeting in Uruguay took place in January 1943 in connection with a conference dealing largely with a consideration of the "Bases for a Just and Durable Peace." There were some 33 members present from both Montevideo and Buenos Aires. Another group met in Buenos Aires later in the year for a more spontaneous and informal discussion. The China meeting was held in Chungking in March 1943 with some twenty staff and faculty members present. The United States group met in January 1943 in New York, in connection with a regular meeting of the Provisional Council of the W.S.C.F. with some twenty members present. The following summary, therefore, is based on reports from four nations and three continents. It represents a kind of long distance conversation and those who took part would not be shy to suggest that others join them as the opportunity arises for other small groups to meet in various parts of the world.

Relationships of Asia and Africa to the "West"

As we saw at the "Poughkeepsie I" meeting, beneath the issue of the balance of power between East and West lies dormant the dangerous conflict which can yet erupt into a world civil war between

"white" and "non-white" races. Within the Federation itself we have an obligation to move constructively wherever the opportunity arises on this issue, and to understand its implications.

China calls attention to the changes already affecting the relationships of East and West. One of these is the shift of Russian industry east of the Urals. Another is the industrialization of India and Australia, and the bearing of this on the standard of living. Both China and the United States express fears over the possible withdrawal of the U.S.A. into a shell of isolationism, and the disastrous consequences which would result. China fears lest the United States revert to a balance-of-power role in the Pacific, strengthening the hand of Japan at the cost of independence and autonomy of other nations. The United States points to the risk of the practices of certain government bodies pre-determining the policies of the country quite apart from and even contrary to the wishes of the people, and stresses the importance of the right training for the people now under government instruction for foreign administrative work during and after the war. As to the objectives to which we should give support, Argentina feels we must be guided by a standard of brotherliness and understanding to replace the attitudes of superiority with which "occidentals" have been accustomed to treat Asiatics and Africans. The basis must be full equality, racially, economically and culturally. Uruguay feels that in order to make such relationships possible to their fullest degree, it would be necessary to give complete independence to the peoples of Asia and Africa. Countries with colonies have an obligation to further education along democratic lines.

As to the immediate lines of action, the United States begins with a very practical suggestion of changing text books used in schools which create harmful attitudes. Uruguay stresses the importance of good cultural relationships as a step towards greater mutual knowledge. Once again the United States points to the importance of dealing with immediate issues, and sees that the racial attitudes and practices of "White America" present an international issue of the first magnitude. Students should be encouraged to forego the charms of far horizons for the more prosaic problems at hand.

The Four Freedoms

This issue is real for Student Christian Movements, many of which exist in communities where the educational system is itself an importation of the foreign power in control, or where missionaries are pledged not to speak on political matters derogatory to the government, or where the economic life of the country can be made or broken at the whim of legislators in another country far away.

Argentina and Uruguay state the "four freedoms" as the objectives towards which to work—as the indispensable minimum for the

post war world, in which no limitations can be set for any group of human beings, and where governments and peoples assimilate and practise the principles of respect for human personality. China feels that the "four freedoms" are not yet sufficiently concrete. There are economic factors which hamper them. They are too negative in the sense of being freedom "from" rather than freedom "for". The U.S.A. sees the risk that the dead weight of material goods and power may crush the life from them prematurely; with small groups of legislators grasping for selfish ends and over-riding the will of the people themselves. The stress is on the great importance of guiding principles, and of individuals carrying their full share of citizenship responsibility.

Relationships with Russia

Within the Federation are those who glow with enthusiasm for Russia: her gallantry under suffering, her morale in fighting against fearful odds, her sense of racial equality, her zeal for economic justice. There are also those, especially in Northern Europe, whose bitterness of feeling against Russia hardly knows any limits. How are we to find our way in the family, both of the Federation and of the nations, to get along without jostling and destroying each other?

China calls attention to the great power of Russia, and the implications in this for the struggle between capitalism and socialism. They feel her alliance with Great Britain is especially important. Chinese students also are appreciative of Soviet victories and of Russian culture (Gorky and others have had a profound effect). They are less concerned in Russia's social system *per se*. Maybe, they say, it is because students are so handicapped in their own living conditions: so absorbed in the problem of food; too short of books; too hampered by government restrictions.

South America senses considerable fear towards the present régime in Russia which must be overcome as a first step towards better relationships. As the U.S.A. points out, certain practices of the Russian government constantly hamper the Christian enterprise in Europe. Both Argentina and Uruguay indicate the importance of objective and unprejudiced study. Uruguay found the Dean of Canterbury's book on Soviet Russia helpful, and were promoting its reading. Several suggestions were made of meetings between U.S.A. or Chinese students with Russian students. Several feel that what Russia had already done towards a greater degree of social justice should be considered as a judgment upon Christians. The U.S.A. said, "Russia would trust us more if we showed a little more respect for human personality in our own country." Argentina says, "We must honestly put Christian principles into practice in the total life of our own country," and comments that while we must repudiate all

unlawful methods employed by the Soviet régime, we must equally avoid resorting to similar methods ourselves.

The Chinese group refers especially to the line of thought of the British S.C.M. which interests them very much. They say: "Great Britain seems to be interested in the synthesis between communist and liberal capitalist democratic principles and practice. The possibilities of such a synthesis should be explored further." And they point to their hope that both in war time and in times of peace the word and the aim "democracy", provided it is genuinely an aim, can serve as the best link between Russia and other countries.

The U.S.A. points to the importance of the Federation's being ready to undertake Student Christian Movement work again at any moment, and having workers and funds in readiness, when the doors open.

Basic convictions about the Nature of the Future World Order

So many Christian organisations have already outlined their convictions that material as it increases, already has a familiar ring through the processes of exchange.

Argentina indicates its conviction that Christians must always keep before their minds, as Reinhold Niebuhr says that "history is moving on towards a final judgment in which Christ will be conqueror". No future order can be formed apart from the God of Jesus. God is not only Lord, but He is also Father and in consequence, Christians must aspire to an order which shall be cemented by brotherly relations between men and nations. China notes the absence of any universal standards in framing a world order. There must be subordination of nations to some higher law: the law of God. There was a suggestion that there might be relevance for this age in the philosophy underlying the ancient Chinese doctrine of the "Mandate of Heaven". China also refers to the kinds of sins which hamper right relationships. The special sin against the oneness of the world under God is the idolatry of state, or race, or class, or any other form of human community. The sin against the unity of God is the kind of isolationism which prevents us from caring for our brother man. The sin against the rights bestowed on man by divine law is the exploitation of others.

The United States feels that the word "democratic" is losing its meaning, and needs to be given more precise content. The group re-emphasises that the obligations of Christians lie, not in formulating the blue prints for world order, nor in supplying the theological bases, but, as was stressed in previous discussions, in the area where these two overlap. The assets of the power for unity of the Christian community must be brought to bear on the common consideration of controversial issues. The idea that Christianity consists of going to church on Sunday, and little else, needs to be

replaced by a faith which is socially channeled. Both China and the United States say that what happens now, during the war years determines the future. We need not look for the bettering of relationships between East and West in a post war world when we are blind to the immediate necessary steps essential to their betterment in the present.

Attention is called by several to the Bible as a source of the universal standards needed as a basis for world order. Uruguay feels human effort is meaningless without being backed by some kind of spiritual reality. The Bible has the power to re-vitalise Christian groups, and needs to be studied more profoundly, and to be listened to more as God's word to our times. The U.S.A. adds that we must strengthen our Bible study work, in material available, in leadership training, in better methods. A note of warning is sounded lest a return to the Bible become confused with a "swing into pietism", and hence full emphasis given to its social relevance.

Function of the University in the Post War World and the Contribution of Christians

The function of the university, says China, is to seek truth, beauty and goodness for their own sake. In the new university, says Argentina, the expression of the abiding principles of Christianity will reign; tolerance, objectivity and highest wisdom. Religion, comments China, is not an extra-curricular activity, but central to the whole thing. There must be an atmosphere of freedom. The United States pointed to the risks of domination of the content of education by various kinds of special interests and stressed the importance of upholding the rightful aim of the university—"the fine and carefree rapture in the discoveries of arts and sciences, and the free, open appreciation of the contributions of learning to the life of man."

The university after the war must be a whole. It will move towards the development of technical capacities for man's domination over nature, as well as of the spiritual perfection of man, considered from a rational and universal point of view; without distinction of class, nation or any other factor. The function of the university will be to socialise culture. That means the embracing by the university of all social problems as objects of study. Uruguay adds that vocational counselling should not be dictated by egotistical interests but by a desire for service and sacrifice. Technical and professional training, says China, should be on a properly based point of view about the world, both intellectual and moral. Such improved orientation is the special responsibility of Christians.

The U.S.A. sees among the special obligations of Christians towards university reconstruction the importance of professors increasingly teaching their subjects from a conscious Christian

basis. China sees the obligation of the Student Christian Movement to complete the job begun by the academic courses. Especially should the resources which S.C.M.s. have by virtue of being part of a world wide community be brought to bear as an influence in the student world. Above all is the call to bear constant witness to God in the midst of any pagan environment.

The U.S.A. suggests organising a Christian Professors Movement for the purpose of reorienting the teaching of all subjects to conscious Christian bases. Uruguay suggests that relationships, exchanges and cultural relationships between students of different nations should be intensively promoted as one of the best means of making known the culture of others; and also that Christian students should feel it their special work to take education and instruction to the people. An example of this is found in the cultural-educational work of the Mexican Government. Also, students find great value in associating with and knowing the life and problems of workers, and of identifying themselves with them during vacation periods.

Uruguay believes that Christian students should take part as much as possible in the directing bodies of student centres, and share in the corporate life of student organisations which influence directly or indirectly the national student climate and the general well being of the University. Argentina sees that the rapprochement of student Christian groups to the university may be realised through the working out of cultural programs as opportunity and favourable means allow, and may mean inviting university students to discuss in an S.C.M. forum and setting, subjects of discussion in which Christian doctrine plays a part. There should be continuous study of the nature of the Christian presuppositions underlying academic studies.

This report of the four discussion meetings is in the nature of a way station in what is hoped will be a long and continuing process. The Chinese S.C.M. has decided to make further discussion of the Officers' questions part of the national program for the coming year. Other movements sending in further reports would be contributing to the common mind we hope to attain during a time when meetings are not possible. We do not know what the divisive issue may prove to be nor where our thinking will lead us in the formation of program and policy. We have a mysterious capacity for unity in the face of all differences, and this we must use to the fullest in the work ahead.

HELEN MORTON.

Fragments of a Discussion in Europe

Taking sides against totalitarianism

A Swiss speaker suggested that the problem of "the economic man" existed on both sides of the present conflict.

Members of the discussion disagreed. They felt that some years ago the problem of the "economic man" could have been spoken of as the cause of the conflict but that today there was a spiritual pressure exercised upon the occupied countries, which was not dictated by economic, but by ideological interest.

The speaker then suggested that every political system presented an attractive side, as well as a repulsive one. Consequently if we bring the positive elements of different systems together, we achieve harmony.

Members of the discussion again disagreed. They pointed out that, while every nation had its good sides, this was not true of systems and ideologies.

The speaker felt that, as Christians, we should strive to create an atmosphere of tolerance and acknowledge the good qualities of all parties. This should be true even in relation to the occupying power, and he instanced the discipline of the Germans.

Members of the discussion felt that such an eclectic position overlooked the fact that the totalitarian phenomenon excluded any eclecticism. Nazi ideology takes the form of a pagan cult, which is incompatible with Christianity. This is to be seen in contrast to the democratic countries, where leaders recognise the relativity and the provisional character of social and political solutions. The verdict was that we could not remain neutral where spiritual issues were involved.

The problem of hatred

A Swiss: Can one take sides spiritually without hating the other side? Is it not possible to love one's neighbour, and yet hate his ideas?

A Frenchman: The French people do make a distinction to some extent between the representatives of the hated régime, and the common man who has to suffer so much. Take, for example, the German soldiers on the Russian front.

A Hungarian: To say that the whole German people is responsible for what has happened is simply to take a racial position. We must make a distinction between the government and the people. Have not Churchill and Stalin themselves said so?

A Frenchman: Don't let us theorise. The fact is that great efforts to overcome national antipathies have borne fruit. Christian

students in France oppose the Nazis but do not hate them. They help German political refugees gladly; that is important.

The Swiss Chairman: Does this not show that the present war is not a national war in the sense of 1914-18, but an international civil war?

A Dutchman: Is not the French attitude described by our friend that of a region which has been occupied only for some months? Will that attitude not change later, as has happened in the case of other countries? In the long run it takes a lot of imagination to go on drawing a distinction between the Nazi and the German, because this distinction does not appear in the facts. Only a select group can maintain this distinction in opposition to primary mass reaction.

A Swiss: At any rate no reconstruction in Europe is possible without reconciliation.

Retribution and political reconstruction

A Dutch speaker: Let us look as Christians at this question of reconciliation. Even if we are in agreement that the Church must call the nations to repent of their common sinfulness, and to work for reconciliation, we are still faced with a dilemma. Some people consider that a common repentance must not lead to a passive attitude towards evil, and that in order to safeguard justice the peace must include a penal element. Other people feel that a common repentance excludes the possibility of punishing nations, and that the main consideration in establishing peace must be reconciliation and the restoration of a genuine order.

A Scotsman: The second point of view is surely unrealistic. Retributive justice will have its place in the armistice; but there only; distributive justice will appear in the final peace treaty. The conditions in the vanquished nations at the end of the war will themselves constitute sufficient punishment.

In the new treaties mistakes may certainly be made by the victorious powers. Provision must be made for peaceful change, and the churches of the victorious powers must be ready to ask the forgiveness of the vanquished for such mistakes.

The speaker: It may be impossible to avoid a violent outbreak of the spirit of revenge especially in Eastern Europe. Therefore those who are responsible for atrocities should be judged by legal means. It will not be an easy matter, and it would be better if each country could judge its own criminals. Measures should be taken by the leading powers, not to punish the guilty *nations,* but to guarantee the future and prevent the outbreak of a third world war.

A Swede: What about the question of national sovereignty? Will the oppressed peoples who have struggled for their freedom be ready to give up part of that freedom immediately?

The speaker: There will need to be a transition stage leading to a world-wide organisation. Instead of attempting to build up immediately an international system of law it may be wiser to begin with those countries where a certain social integration has already been achieved.

A Frenchwoman: When we speak of a common basis of law we ought to remember that there are different spheres of law. An agreement might be reached between nations in one sphere and not in another, for example in the economic sphere, rather than in the political.

The political function of the Church and of Christians

The Dutch speaker put forward this position: that the Church can reconstruct world order by being itself the community of the new creation. In a world torn apart by national monomanias and hatreds it demonstrates its own universal character and bears witness to the solidarity of all races and nations.

A member of the discussion: Is such action possible in a country where the government and the majority of the people are not Christian? What about Japan?

The speaker: It is a serious problem in Japan. But look at China where Christians are also a tiny minority and yet their witness has been remarkable.

A member of the discussion: Yes. But what about Germany? Has not the Church lost too much ground to exert any real influence?

The speaker: Why, in Germany the Church has become more of a reality than has been the case for centuries! This has been a quite unexpected development. The Church is the one focus of resistance, and at the end of the present conflict it will be the one positive force in a vacuum.

A member of the discussion: That's all very well, but what can the Church *do?*

The speaker: The Church in Germany is far more involved in public affairs than it was in the last war. A real effort is being made; there is a new directness and concreteness in preaching. Christians have begun to think about reconstruction even before the war has ended. In Europe as a whole the Church has been the great and active prophetic force dealing concretely with political realities. More than ever before the Church has therefore the possibility of making its voice heard.

A member of the discussion: Do you mean a Christian political programme?

The speaker: No. One cannot speak in terms of Christian politics, because the Church, as such, cannot endorse a particular

political programme. The Church cannot come forward with a *system*. Yet we must get rid of individualism; the Church must give a lead in great historical moments.

A Frenchwoman: Should we not make a distinction here? *Positively* the Church can only state the main lines of action. *Negatively* it must speak up concretely when the law of God is violated. On the other hand the members of the Church must make concrete political decisions, and the Church should help them to form their political judgments on a Christian basis.

A German: Should Christians, then, try to constitute a Christian political party?

The speaker: That depends upon the political situation in a particular country. There was such a party before the war in Holland. This is a complex question, because misunderstandings and exclusiveness can so easily arise. A Christian political party could only be efficient in matters where Christians have a distinctive attitude of their own.

A Frenchman: The witness of the Church is more powerful in times of crisis; the Church then takes a lead. In peace time the Church has a habit of following suit behind other forces.

The speaker: That is why there are greater possibilities in times of crisis. But we must not allow the Church to drop back into silence after the war.

A German: Reconstruction will be relatively easy in France, and Belgium and Holland, where the middle classes have achieved a stability and order unknown in Germany. In the latter country the problem will be altogether different. The Confessional Church should go much further still and form a programme of reconstruction. All parties have compromised and are responsible for the present situation. The one body which might speak with authority is the Church.

A Frenchman: Speaking as a Catholic I am concerned with this question of the political competence of the Church. The Church must emphasise the struggle towards a goal which will never be attained. The Church is not competent to deal with technical details.

A Swiss: There will surely be great differences in outlook, for example between American and French or German Christians. Will the Church be able to find a common message in political matters?

THE EDITOR'S TRAVEL DIARY

I had not realised how much at home I had become on the North American continent until I landed again in New York. A piece of machinery turned over in my mind and I clicked into the American way of life. If I were to put the experience in a word, I should say that it was one of expansion. *Suddenly there were about me more facilities, more comfort, more food, more light, more newspapers. And shortly I discovered that there was more ignorance of events in other countries and more eagerness to know; more enthusiasm for rebuilding the world and more fuss and bother! It had been exhilarating to visit Britain, and now it was exhilarating to return.*

Poughkeepsie II

Before I had time to turn round I was whisked off to another W.S.C.F. consultative meeting, which I had had no hand in preparing. Helen Morton has described it in a letter to Geneva in the Third Quarter of The Student World, *but she has not made clear that without a great deal of work on her part it would never have taken place. At once I was struck by certain contrasts between this meeting and the* Kenilworth *meeting in London three months previously. In London we were nearer the European continent, and our European delegates were more representative of the immediate situation in their countries. At Poughkeepsie we had a greater sense of world-wideness, and our discussion arose much less out of European problems. Indeed the Poughkeepsie meeting was remarkably international, not only in delegations, but in balance.*

The main distinction, however, was a more subtle one. Our vice-chairman speaks of the North American delegation as being "solid, complacent . . . a bit ponderous". Far be it from me to contradict her! but it was not complacency that occurred to my mind, but remoteness. This has partly to do with the war being fought a long way from New York State, but more, I believe, with two other reasons. The first is that American S.C.M. leaders have at present a very difficult job of adjustment owing to the

situation created by Selective Service in the colleges, and when so gigantic an organisation has to be adjusted a great deal of energy is required. Consequently I had a feeling that the Americans present were preoccupied with national problems to which international ones seemed to bear little relation. In the second place the American S.C.M. has been almost entirely uninfluenced in recent years by the thinking of any other movement; and so the great religious and theological questions facing the Federation as a whole tend to seem academic questions, when discussed on American soil. This is in marked contrast to the British S.C.M., whose leaders are highly theological in their interests, and leap at the last piece of information from the continent of Europe as a piece of evidence for their own religious position!

Natural law

One of the places where this contrast was most clearly seen was in the nature of the discussion at Poughkeepsie. We made a valiant attempt to be upsides with our confrères in Europe in tackling natural law and were singularly unsuccessful! On the other hand talk became quickly and usefully alive when we turned to the vexed question of co-operation between Christian and secular organisations, and between Christians and non-Christians. Here was a problem which existed in the American campus setting, but which only few observed to be really a theological problem, and, indeed, our old friend, natural law! Be that as it may, my visits to Sweden and Britain, and my constant reading of material sent to me by my colleagues in Geneva, convinces me that we are not deeply sundered on political issues. Our political hopes and plans for the future are nowhere very inspired, and yet have a remarkable similarity. Where we differ is on the religious groundplan upon which we hope to build the future. Biblical theology, which is meat and drink in Europe, in the British universities, and indeed in some Canadian S.C.M. circles, is a queer kind of caviare in the United States.

Reconstruction plans

The theological issue is focussed on our whole discussion of university *and* Federation *reconstruction. As Helen Morton puts*

it, there is "the Federation's share in general *relief. Then there is the* special *work which the Federation must do in its own right to be prepared to help member movements in every possible way. Perhaps our chief problem is how to find* the right combination of these two. *It's the fine art of collaboration on a Christian basis." In both the* Kenilworth *and* Poughkeepsie *meetings there was immediate recognition of the twofold responsibility of the W.S.C.F.; but in Britain the balance is gently tipped towards the* specifically Christian *side, while in the United States it is tipped towards* the general relief by Christians *side. This is not the place to discuss that issue, but only to give notice that this is one of the points to which the theological questions before the Federation bear immediate reference. Personally I welcome these shades of opinion. They betoken life and interest, though they do not make it easy to compose a memorandum!*

However, that memorandum on The W.S.C.F. and Reconstruction *has now been written and sent to national movements. It is only tentative for many, on whose judgment and co-operation we rely, are "in the silence", but it is a pledge of action. The main lines were clearly and cogently laid down at an enlarged meeting of the Officers of the W.S.C.F. upon the American continent. Not only had the three officers the benefit of the advice of certain American and Canadian leaders, and of notes of similar discussions in Geneva, Sweden, and Britain, but they had the inestimable benefit of two representatives of China and one of Japan. The stages in the strategy of the United Nations have an unfortunate way of influencing the outlook of the Christian Church, and a "Europe first" attitude is always in danger of creeping into plans for Christian reconstruction. Quite apart from timing we must think of the world as a whole, and the future as a whole. It was on this point that direct representation of the Far East kept our officers' meeting so much more in the true tradition of the W.S.C.F., than if it had been held anywhere else. Kung Pu-Sheng was with us, just about to leave for China to take up work again with the student Y.W.C.A. Lyman Hoover, a most loyal W.S.C.F. veteran, had recently arrived from Chungking. In the course of discussion he mentioned casually his conversation with Augustine Ralla Ram in India only a*

week or two ago. And so he brought us a wide view of the Orient, because, like all travellers from China today, he had circled the world on his way home.

At home in Canada

Though it was in New York I landed, it was to Canada that I came home. Perhaps the most interesting immediate result of my trip to Europe has been my entry into closer relationships with the churches and senior people in Canada, particularly of course in Toronto. The Canadian S.C.M. did a grand job in creating opportunities for me to speak about my visits to Britain and Sweden, and especially about the Church in Europe. Canadian friendship does not blossom overnight. You are quickly and cordially accepted and then left "to paddle your own canoe". But other people are paddling theirs beside you, and the occasional hail is reassuring. Then quite suddenly you find you are "one of us" and that you are expected to make your contribution without the fuss of undue persuasion. I could not ask for congregations, church committees, or groups of senior friends more receptive to news of the Ecumenical Church, or more anxious to find ways in which they can help the Federation. I start the winter with great hopes of building up this interest for the future. The Canadian S.C.M. has chosen new leaders in Gerald Hutchinson and Harriet Christie, but they were "thirled" to the Federation "lang syne"! And always there is Hugh Macmillan with his heart in the Far East, and his eyes on Europe, to pop into our office with shrewd comment and advice. Perhaps this piece of diary is coloured because I am sitting on a Canadian islet looking through a couple of birch trees up a very blue lake amongst the woods with a wind from the West rustling the pine trees; but I have a strong conviction that the Federation will never regret that half its headquarters once accepted the hospitality of the Dominion of Canada.

American students in council

In September, 1940, I had visited the National Intercollegiate Christian Council of the U.S.A. at its meeting at Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, and so I was glad to be invited back again in June

three years later. It gave me a chance to study the changes in the American S.C.M. in the war period. It seems almost a breach of courtesy to write critically of that friendliest of student committees, and I was aware of Ed Espy's quizzical eye on me, as I sat through the sessions. He and I had been together a little on the outside in 1940, strangers out of Europe; and now along with Eleanor French he was one of the guiding secretaries. What a lot of humour there is, and ought to be, in any S.C.M. committee—especially incidental and accidental humour. I treasure two such moments. One was when a chairman feeling for the right expression stumbled upon evangelism, and hastily added: "I know it's a revolting word"! Not at all a bad way of emphasising the centrality of the Gospel to an American student crowd, I thought. The other was when a student referred to the difficulty of interpreting the Christian message to the majority of men on the campus—because "they're happy already"!

These two sallies—and how brilliant are the sallies of American students!—are useful pointers. There is an earnest desire, especially on the part of the younger generation of student leaders, to know what Christianity is, and to get it across to others. At present there is no language for the expression of this desire, because the old words are revolting, yes, honestly revolting, and the new ones are mostly such as mask the truth. There would be keen theological interest and discussion in the American S.C.M. tomorrow, if someone knew how to begin. (Let it always be remembered that Reinhold Niebuhr is not the prophet of the American, but of the British S.C.M.!) Then there is the trouble that the American student is "happy already", and does not need the Gospel. Well, is he? Older people at the meeting doubted it, and spoke of his searchings of heart. But his uneasiness and uncertainty do not naturally draw him to the Christian movement. Do they ever? There is one other factor to add to the situation. We met in the Middle West, and the war seemed very far away, except for a shortage of butter in the Dairy State. Lyman Hoover spoke through a thunderstorm, and illustrated from our upheaval, as we ran for shelter in the middle of his speech, the kind of continuous distraction which besets the Chinese S.C.M. But the thunderstorm was not an air-raid, and

there was no use pretending. Besides the newspapers carried internal politics on their headlines, and not the anguish of Russia or China. Even though his relatives are overseas it is not easy yet for the American student to realise that the world is adrift without a rudder in a terrific thunderstorm.

Their dominating interests

Given the factors which I have so inadequately described it is scarcely surprising that the sensitiveness of the American Y.M. or Y.W. student is still most quickly touched by immediate social problems, without much idea of their relation to world issues, still less to the crisis of all humanity. And yet there is something immensely encouraging in his dogged determination to face the issues of American society, which are so sharp, and so ominous. It is a sound instinct which makes him refuse to be swayed by great general conceptions which he cannot comprehend, like anti-fascism, and makes him stick to evils which he has met, and knows by name. One of the finest moments of debate was when a group of students, one after the other, rejected categories supplied by experts, in favour of a plain list of wrongs. It is surely far better to be led from a situation, which you know and can act about, to an understanding of the wider content of that situation.

An excellent example is the interest in the internment of American citizens of Japanese, or partly Japanese, race. At the N.I.C.C. meeting there was a splendid group of American students of Japanese descent; and the attitude of the Christian forces in the universities to the release and relocation of these students has been beyond praise. Not Pearl Harbor, but the action of the military authorities on the West Coast, has stirred the American student to a realisation of the war in the Far East. To start from a liking for, and loyalty to, fellow students of Japanese race, and go on to see the need for the defeat of the military power of Japan is a healthy process. As I watched the assembly I noted another curious fact and that was the high proportion of American students of German race amongst those who were giving the most constructive lead. The composite nature of the American people is a very great strength. I found my conviction renewed that on

the American campuses world order might be thrashed out more profitably than anywhere else in the world. Only it would need a generation clear enough in its thinking not to confuse world order with the American way of life. And that is not an easy distinction for them to make.

Theology or democracy

The alternative to theology in the American S.C.M. is democracy. Instead of wrestling with ultimate verities, you make lists of the ideas which have drifted into your mind. Instead of waiting with solemnity upon the will of God, you go through the complicated process of deciding by ballot. In a curious way theology is expected to grow out of democracy which is in itself the precious and ultimate truth. That may be a caricature, yet it is not unlike the living situation in which the American Christian student has grown up. Consequently he must *begin there, and no exhortation otherwise will affect him. If the eighth chapter of Romans is the key passage for the British S.C.M., the American student finds his starting point in the story of the good Samaritan. He believes the world ought to be better, more Christian, and that his job is to help it along a bit—an intention no one should despise. But, more than that, he is taking his* charity *seriously, and asking how he may do it in the name of Christ. He is on the verge of a great and powerful discovery of revealed religion, and he will go through with it. What hinders him most is the theological time-lag of many of his elders and betters, for he has few books and little preaching to help him. Yet his adventure in religion is one of the most thrilling, and perhaps one of the most decisive, events in the life of the Federation. He may be "the odd man out" when we all meet again at Federation conferences; or he may perhaps be the one of us all who has most abandon in the Gospel.*

An international round-table

It was an honour to be invited by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America to participate in the International Round Table of Christian leaders held at Princeton in July, and to be adopted by the Canadian churchmen as a member of their

delegation. Church papers will be carrying the reports of this meeting, and I need not here elaborate the programme, or describe the resulting documents. We worked very hard in very hot weather. Certainly it is amazing how much common consideration of post-war problems is taking place in the churches internationally today; and it is particularly encouraging to find the "six pillars of peace" formulated by the American communion taken as the norm for future discussion in some other countries.

As one would have expected the indirect contribution of past experience in the W.S.C.F. was there in the persons of many of the sixty delegates. The Australian and New Zealand delegates brought me into personal touch with the S.C.M. To me it was a particular joy to meet again "Sandy" Hsia, now head of Chinese Information in the States, but once a fellow member of the S.C.M. committee in the University of Glasgow. I still remember his comment at a committee retreat twenty years ago: "The trouble with you people is your Christian upbringing"! As usual it was the Chinese delegation which brought the gift of fresh appreciation and expression into a meeting which moved a little cumbrously.

Ecumenical leadership

A Dutch delegate, who spoke once or twice with a simplicity and humility that was deeply moving, asked me candidly one evening for a definition of a Christian leader, *since he felt a little out of place, and I made a poor answer! The fact that we were an* important *meeting, and had to put things on paper for other people's inspiration, or criticism, tended to stultify our discussion. I thought we were much at our best in a splendidly direct message "to the many Christians separated from us by the barriers of war who remain steadfast in the faith". Significantly enough it was drafted by our chief expert, so it was the setting, and the presence perhaps of unofficial officialdom, which made some of our statements a little sententious. I doubt very much whether it is really helpful for a group of Christian leaders, speaking as churchmen, to make public suggestions about future relationships with particular countries, while we are in the midst of war. There is a difference between worldly wisdom, and "the mind of Christ",*

which the exigencies of warfare, and immediate alliances tend to obscure. I had rather see us work outwards from the "six pillars of peace", and I hope that readers of The Student World *will find them out and reflect upon them in relation to their own countries.*

If ever I had considered that the great work of the World Council of Churches was going to overshadow that of more amateur bodies like the Federation, that notion was dispelled by this meeting. We can learn enormously from the far greater knowledge possessed by senior groups, but we can make a contribution, which perhaps will come no other way. The ecumenical movement needs a steady flow of men and women, who have come to think instinctively in ecumenical terms, who are freed from the necessity of defending their own church or national point of view and are concerned with the total life of the Christian Church in the world. That is a hard gift to acquire later in life, and the best training is membership of a local fellowship, which knows it is part of a world-wide fellowship. In the days ahead we must multiply beyond all previous experience opportunities for students to meet internationally in a Christian setting. It is our duty to the Church of the future.

William Paton

An outstanding example of this contribution of the W.S.C.F. to the Ecumenical Church was the life of William Paton. As the news of his death reached me on vacation in Canada I realised that God in His inscrutable wisdom had made things very difficult for those of us who care about the unity and mission of His Church. Bill Paton, as no one who knew him could help calling him, was one on whom so much of the future depended, and now we shall have to find our way without him, and must learn to discover for ourselves some of the things, which he at the very zenith of his leadership would have shown us.

But it was not so much of the secretary of the International Missionary Council, or of the World Council of Churches that I found myself thinking, as of one who proved his gift of understanding and leadership in earlier days as an S.C.M. secretary. Only a month or two ago I was talking with a former colleague,

who will miss him sorely, and he reminded me of the manager's tent at British S.C.M. conferences at Swanwick, where Bill once reigned supreme. Nothing could be more ludicrous than the title of camp manager, but it was he who set the character of the men's camp. New fangled fashions came in, and we ceased to be so much a camp and more a conference. Something was lost then, or was it because there was only one Bill Paton? Then I think of the international conference of the British S.C.M. in Glasgow in 1921, and how he seized me, a student whom he scarcely knew, by the shoulder one day and said, "take me to a printer". I wonder if any of the Student Volunteers who signed cards on that occasion realised that we faked them on to the presses, and did not get them right! But I learnt something about missionary dedication I have been unable to forget.

One could add so many more memories which are characteristic of the man. Always they are of being in the company of one "who knew his stuff", and did not suffer fools gladly; but who would give another man his time and his mind in the Lord's service any day, and leave him knowing more and caring more. I shall think of him always poised on his feet like a boxer, shrugging his shoulder to make his point, and finishing it with some sally which on anyone else's lips would have been a disaster, but with him opened men's minds and hearts. If you felt hurt at the contradiction of your opinion, further reflection almost always assured you that the balance of wisdom and shrewdness were on his side.

Perhaps this is not the kind of thing which should be said about one who will stand out to many readers, and rightly, as a foremost Christian leader. (He *deserved the name!*) *But William Paton hated bluff and sham, and was keen, desperately keen, about the student Christian movements in every country, because he believed that the universities should be won for Christ, and loved to take a hand in the venture with the men and women whom he trusted. If ever we are tempted to think that all this business of the Church Universal has any meaning outside the Gospel, and the missionary Gospel, let us remember William Paton and be pulled back to our main purpose as Christians with the greatest of all jobs to do.*

R. C. M.

THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

Christian Literary Criticism

Some notes supplied by a friend of the Federation, which show how the struggle for Christian faith in Germany is reflected in critical articles in a literary review

It is well known that the publication of many Christian periodicals has been suspended in Germany, and that this presents great difficulties to the Christian forces in the country. Some Christian magazines, however, remain, and one of the most interesting is *Eckart,* a monthly literary journal. It contains articles and poems written by Christians and others who accept a spiritual view of life. It reaches into very important spheres of the Church's influence, for example the universities, the chaplaincy to the forces, and the evangelistic work of the Church; in addition it has several thousand individual subscribers, including professors, pastors, teachers and people in a variety of walks of life. Ths trend of the articles is significant in that they provide a consciously Christian orientation of thought within the present-day framework of intellectual life. Further, discussion of non-Christian and anti-Christian tendencies is steadily being continued. Such discussion is particularly important in face of the constant efforts of Rosenberg's training scheme, which is being promoted by schools of the national-socialist order in various parts of Germany. In the following paragraphs some of these articles, and some of this discussion, is summarised.

Goethe: Christian or pagan?

Some recent articles have dealt with a controversy about Goethe, between those who are interested in his relationship to a religious interpretation of life, and to the Christian faith in general, and those who regard him as the "great pagan" and the one who "overcame" Christian views. In an article on Goethe's "Divan-Poem", a testament of an old Persian faith, it is clearly shown what is important to Goethe, namely that the centre and "heart of poetry" is the praise of God, this being the driving-force which becomes more and more manifest in this famous poem. In this connection a well-known saying of John Sebastian Bach is quoted: "The aim and purpose of the base part should be nothing else but the glory of God and the

re-creation of the soul. Where this is not heeded there is no real music but a devilish grinding and clatter." The work of Beethoven is also purposely connected with this approach, and it is pointed out that the ninth symphony was created at the same time as these poems of Goethe. The conclusion is then drawn that "such utterances reveal how the leading German spirits stand in the great tradition of faith, even if this word has to be interpreted differently for each of them."

In the same number of *Eckart* there is a critical article on a book on Goethe's relationship to the Christian faith, published by a definitely anti-Christian publishing house (Nordland Verlag, Berlin). This book, *Wolfgang von Goethe: his genius and his world; his pronouncements on religion and Christianity,* tries to prove that "Goethe had ceased to be a Christian, and could not be called one." The critical analysis of Goethe's developing *Weltanschauung,* given in this book, is accepted after sober examination on those points where the analysis provides sound proof. But it is also clearly shown "that the word of the Bible retained for Goethe a revealing quality. Even though it was not fully identical with the Church's teaching, it was still the illuminating, self-revealing and judging word." A further comment reads: "It is quite certain that Goethe was not 'Bible-shy', but rather well-versed in the Bible, and this not in the outward sense of biblical knowledge. Rather we see that his spirit was profoundly touched by the Bible, and in the very contradictions we can detect a sign of the lively emotions which the Bible created in him."

Christianity and modern culture

It is especially important in this connection to note that the thoughtful work of Ed. Spranger, *World-Piety,* published in Leipzig in 1942, was taken into account. This book examines the origin of Goethe's form of life and of faith, points out its limits as well as its hidden relation to Christian religious insight. The closing words of this book are quoted: "Modern western culture is so deeply embedded in a Christian interpretation of life that it accepts presuppositions which would have been impossible before the appearance of Christianity. This is the unconscious Christianity referred to. Tacitly it is also included in world-piety, since the latter presupposes that the soul need not worry about its salvation, but is already saved through a greater act of love in eternity. Finally it presupposes that the unknown God is already known, and that therefore He has revealed Himself in the deepest sense. There are manifold degrees of revelation, in which light shines for men in the darkness. The final revelation is the one in which the mysteries of life become revealed, not to those who know, but to those who believe; where all suffering becomes positive, so that the awful sign of the Cross can become the supreme sign of victory over the world."

Such evidences as these indicate how leading representatives of German intellectual life, especially those who were, and are, teaching in the universities, have found their way to Christian faith and thought and how today they have gained courage to state their convictions openly even though in doing so they come into open conflict with the present "official" position of national-socialist training and education.

A witness to the Church Universal

In the same issue of *Eckart* the present generation is introduced in a living and arresting fashion to certain Christian personalities, such as that essentially German figure, August Vilmar. A sketch of Vilmar is given, and attention is called to his book *The History of German National Literature* and to his three volumes entitled *On the History of German Culture*. In the latter work Vilmar points out the close relation between German history, the growth and existence of the German people, and the Christian faith.

In this connection it is noteworthy that a well-known German writer and poet, Otto von Taube, accepts Vilmar's statements about the Church. According to this view the Church is only now beginning to achieve its full maturity. "The differences between the confessions," writes von Taube, "are becoming unessential in view of the decision: for or against Christ. The One, Holy, Catholic, Christian Church, which is taught but never experienced, will in the near future be finally experienced and so realised, just as centuries ago monotheism and then the Sonship and at the same time the humanity of Jesus were experienced. Thus the Church of the creed, 'the community of saints', will take the place of the individual churches. The true Church, expressed in the third article of the creed, is still ahead of Christianity." These comments constitute a definite witness to the universal community of the churches in spite of the avowed attacks of some radical representatives of national-socialism on the Church universal and the ecumenical movement. Further the statements are important because of the entirely new form of exchange of thought on a profound basis, which is going on today between leading Protestant and Catholic Christians, with the approval of the official church authorities.

In concluding his article Otto von Taube adds a word from one of the finest representatives of the younger Christian generation, who has fallen in the war: "The task of Christendom is not that men should work for their own blessedness, but that they should make the cause of Christ their own, because since the first Easter Christians have been waging war against Satan. Jesus Christ is our leader in this enterprise; without Him we can make no advance, nor yet without men who are willing to give themselves to Him." This message came in a letter from the front. It is indicative of the attitude of

thousands of officers and men that the question of the future of the Church and of Christian education occupies a prominent place in letters written home from the front.

Christianity and Civilisation

An article on St. Augustine's *Civitas Dei* is another example of the way in which a wrong view of the Church, and attacks on its historical reality, are being openly taken up. An initial statement is set down which leads right into the present discussion of Christian faith and modern paganism. St. Augustine is quoted as follows: "The task of my book will be to defend the glorious city of God against those who prefer their own gods to its Founder."

The relation between our present civilisation and the results of Christianity is clearly and firmly pointed out. "Those who view history with a fair appraisal will surely discover that the City of God was able to create a Christian civilisation, and they will not accept the dominance of an unchristian spirit, no matter where and how much it is prevalent, as a pretext for denying any Christianisation whatever. But they will also not impute merits to the civilisations of the world, which would certainly be impossible without Christianity." Characteristic of this position is a further statement: "It is a new discovery for us today that St. Augustine's work is not tied to the ecclesiastical idea of a Roman world empire, but derives its life from the freedom created by the Holy Spirit."

Another discussion, related to a newly published book, points out its totally mistaken conception of the "origins of Christianity", and its "fundamental uncertainty as regards the historical reality of the Church". Through a piece of New Testament interpretation it is shown how utterly mistaken is the thesis of a fundamental lack of historical self-consciousness in Christianity and in the Church. "In reality the Gospel shows that Jesus Himself pointed out the way for the future of the Church in history." This statement must also be considered in relation to continuous attacks on the function of the Christian Church in the public life of a nation.

Prayer and spiritual recovery

A contribution entitled *The threefold source of our mother tongue* is another example of the way in which the inner connection between the German nature and existence and the Christian faith is being demonstrated to wider circles. The relation of the German language to the thought content of the Bible is shown in various ways, and the very centre of the Christian faith is emphasised. Prayer is seen as the point at which "a man gives himself fully to the Lord, and identifies himself with the Spirit and Will of God." In quoting a saying of the Christian author Reinhold Schneider, the

difference is pointed out between beginning from dependence upon God, or from the loss of this Christian attitude.

The article goes on to point out where we stand today. "The history of the German language is at a stage where many great and holy words have lost, or are in the process of losing, their divine content, and their heart-compelling power. And when holy words die, that also dies in us which they sought to express. Such an eventuality would be an enormous loss, for we ourselves would also have to die in consequence." A way of avoiding this danger is shown in the following quotation from a well-known German writer, Max Pickard: "Man can do nothing else than take these words which he has received from God Himself and has partly destroyed, and give them back to God, so that He may make them whole again. Man still has the possibility of bringing them back to God, so that they may become, through His wholeness and clarity, whole and clear again. This possibility he has in prayer." The significance of such a statement can only be estimated by those who know from the numerous letters of German officers and men what place prayer has attained for them in the severe fighting, and many difficulties, through which they are passing. It has become for them the inmost centre of power, and their last resort.

An African View of the S.C.M.

I am going to attempt to discuss briefly from my own experience of the S.C.M. at Achimota, Gold Coast, in the British S.C.M. and from my contacts with S.C.M. members from other parts of the world, what the S.C.M. really is. It is not intended here to give a historical survey of the movement. I desire to give out what I consider the S.C.M. is and ought to be.

1. The S.C.M. is an organisation of "Student Christians" in a University or a College with a view to studying and understanding the implications of the Christian faith. The various S.C.M.s of the world are miraculously (to use Robert Mackie's expression) knit together by an international federation known as the World's Student Christian Federation. It is important to realise the significance of the term "Student Christian". It implies that the members are not all necessarily Christians, but are all desirous of studying the Christian religion, although it is a fervent hope that membership in the movement will eventually lead to membership in the Church. It must also be noted that the Movement is *not* called "Christian Student Movement" which would then mean that it was founded exclusively for Christian students. The term "Student Christian"

therefore makes it possible for *all* students (Christians and non-Christians) to become members of the Movement.

2. The S.C.M. is a cross-section of the Church. When we take a cross-section of a piece of engineering material, the cross-section is exactly the same as any other section taken at any other point, provided the material is homogeneous in structure. One would naturally infer that since the structure of the Church is by no means homogeneous (judging by the denominational differences) the S.C.M. is necessarily by this definition an organisation of entangled and controversial theological and doctrinal differences. Fortunately my experience has been to the contrary. It is true that the various members of the Movement belong to various denominations, but it is also true that one of the miracles of the Church is that in spite of these differences we are all bound together by the central fact of the Christian religion, namely our faith in Him Who died to save us all. In fact, in a true sense the S.C.M. is an ecumenical organisation. We are all agreed on the "fact of our living faith", and I have never spent a more happy time in my life than my four years' membership in the S.C.M.

3. The S.C.M. represents the Church in the University or College. This is not difficult to see if we accept the first definition. If the S.C.M. is a cross-section of the Church then it must bear a resemblance to the Church; it must radiate forth in full splendour the reflected light of the life of the Church. This is what I consider the most fundamental function of the S.C.M. The primary function of the Church is evangelism—the preaching of the gospel of salvation to men whose hearts are in the bondage of sin—as well as teaching people the meaning of the gift of life. In fact it is the function of the Church to help its members to the fullest realisation of the Christian philosophy of life. The S.C.M. in the University has a function not less than this; our duty is primarily evangelism among our fellow students, to help them to come to know the love, and to enjoy the fellowship of Christ—a duty which though difficult to perform is sternly incumbent upon us. "His grace is sufficient for us", and by that grace we should be able to help others to the Christian way of living and thinking. Take away this function, and the S.C.M. collapses into a dead organisation. It is, however, clear that if we are to fulfil this function, we ourselves must be prepared to be the ambassadors of Christ, in fact we must live up to the ideals of holiness and sanctity and fellowship with the Master; we must prepare our minds and be ready to be the living witnesses of the eternal purpose of God which is enshrined in the pages of the Gospels.

4. Every member of the Movement by virtue of his being a student has an obligation to *study and use his mind to think hard* about the great things of the Christian faith. Let me say at once

to all who are doubtful about our study groups that these groups have a definite part in the life of the S.C.M., their existence is fully justified. We study (or we should study) first of all the Word of God, because that is life, that is our inspiration, that is our authority. We will all do well to use study outlines as guidance on the path of discovering the hidden treasures of the Bible. Without a knowledge of the Bible our efforts are very inadequate. I must also say that to those of us who are non-theological students, especially the science students (of whom I am one), Bible study is especially and pertinently important, as by this means we are able to learn some theology, a knowledge which is vital for the better understanding of the nature of God. Bible study has given me a clearer understanding of Who God is quite apart from the assistance it has given me in other directions.

But Bible study is not our only study function. We, like all other students, have got to keep abreast with the times, and so we find ourselves studying economics, politics, international relationships, industry, psychology, etc., with a view to having a true knowledge of these problems and discovering our position as thinking Student Christians relative to them.

5. One last word: all our study efforts should be the visible expression and unified attempt to worship and love the Lord in reverence with the gift of our minds. We are commanded that we should love the Lord our God with all our heart, soul, strength and *mind*. This is the justification of the existence of study groups. Christ makes a totalitarian demand on the whole of our human personality; we should not hold back a mite from Him. We should use every bit of our being, our mind being no exception, in His service and to His glory.

—J. S. Annan.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Christian Faith and Contemporary Culture[1]

An exposition and appraisal of the Gifford lectures by Reinhold Niebuhr, delivered at Edinburgh in 1939.

The exposition of the Christian doctrine of the Atonement as the solution of the problem of human nature and human destiny is an event. It has, of course, always been so. For this doctrine is rooted in the original *kerygma* which was received with wonder and amazement (Acts 2) and it imposes upon the thoughts and activities of men in the world certain limitations which are never readily recognised and accepted. But the thoughts and activities of men in the modern world have been shaped by tendencies which have presupposed the irrelevance of the doctrine of the Atonement and have resolutely turned toward alternate solutions. Indeed, the lectures which have been delivered during this century on the Gifford Foundation are notable indications of this state of affairs. The terms of Lord Gifford's bequest have, it is true, obliged the lecturer to focus his attention upon natural theology so that the prevailing fund of knowledge pertaining to the natural world and to man as a part of the order of nature was carefully explored as largely defining the terms in which the specifically Christian revelation was to be understood. The argument has been in the main theistic. And it could be conducted with equal facility and forcefulness by the natural scientist and the theologian. Perhaps it is not too much to say that the discussion was more welcome when it emanated from the laboratory than when it emanated from the Church. Such was the temper of the time. Men had become accustomed to thinking about the world in terms of process and experiment and measurement. And in so far as they thought also about themselves and about God, they were inclined to include this knowledge within the wider context of

[1]The lectures have since been published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, in two volumes, under the title, *The Nature and Destiny of Man,* Volume I, on *Human Nature,* appeared in 1941; Volume II, on *Human Destiny* appeared in 1943; each volume, $2.75.

previously established data and methods of analysis.[1] Thus, the most distinguished and influential expositions of the Christian faith were committed from the first to presuppositions and criteria which were characteristic of the total cultural situation. It was not denied that the Church had a mind of its own. But the resourcefulness of its thinkers was held proven rather by the cultural relevance of their theologies than by the extent to which those theologies revitalised the profound and permanent insights in the Church's reflection upon its faith and life in the world.

The Primacy of Revelation

Since 1938, however, the audiences at Edinburgh and Aberdeen have heard different sounds. For the first time, the terms of Lord Gifford's bequest were challenged by the beneficiary. It remained for Karl Barth[2] to carry the attack upon the bondage of theology to culture, which he had begun on the continent, to the theological pinnacle of the English-speaking world. Barth took up the question of natural theology itself and emphatically rejected this whole approach to the question of the truth revealed in Christ by which Christianity stands or falls. But Barth did more. He provided the theologian with a model for his own work. He took up an established symbol of the mind and the faith of the Church—the Scottish Confession—and expounded it in such a way as to make the listeners unable to forget either that they were living in the modern world or that the Christian faith had a claim upon them. Whatever one may think about Barth's argument—and we are not concerned with that here—it is significant that the Gifford lectures since his own are unmistakably different from those which preceded. A shift of interest has occurred and consequently a revised sense of what is important when a theologian speaks. It is now a part of the record of this distinguished theological series that theology does not abandon the cultural problem when it concerns itself with its own substance and method. On the contrary. This kind of theological

[1] The most extreme cases in point are perhaps the Gifford lectures by two American scholars. William James' *The Varieties of Religious Experience,* 1901-02, and John Dewey's *The Quest for Certainty,* 1929, are not even theistic. The former is an account of the morphology of what can be observed and measured as *religious;* whereas the latter is an analysis of the conditions of life in the world which define the validity (truth) of what occurs. In neither case, is the lecturer particularly concerned with the *Christian* religion despite the apologetic terms of the lectureship. In both cases, the approach to the problem of religious truth is external, so external indeed as to transform the problem itelf from a substantival to an adjective one. American theological history, to be sure, is partly determinative of this extreme approach to the problem, particularly the revolt against Calvinism. But the point is that James and Dewey express a radical extension and not a radical correction of the main line of thinking which has informed the Gifford lectures.

[2] *The Knowledge of God and the Service of God,* 1937-38.

thinking discerns the cultural problem more profoundly and defines it more accurately. It begins frankly with the Christian faith as a revealed faith and it is continually governed by the fact of revelation in its account of the world and of man's place in the world.[1]

The history of contemporary theology, then, could be instructively written with reference to what has been said and published at Lord Gifford's request. The lectures which he established are barometric of the cultural pressures upon the mind of the Christian Church and of the corresponding impact of the Christian faith upon the spiritual climate of recent times. Professor Reinhold Niebuhr's contribution to this distinguished succession is no exception to the rule. Indeed, in several ways this work is unique and rightly and inescapably in the forefront of theological thought and debate at the present moment. For one thing, Dr. Niebuhr explicitly addresses himself to the total problem of contemporary culture—its presuppositions, its permanent insights and its ominous defects. The breadth and penetration of his analysis are certain to overrule all well-intentioned hesitation about so bold and comprehensive an attempt. For there can be no doubt that the revolutionary times through which we are passing have raised with critical urgency the question of the foundation and the direction which can give significance to human life in the world. In the second place, Dr. Niebuhr explicitly proceeds on the assumption that the Christian faith possesses the final truth about the world because it comprehends human nature and human destiny more adequately than alternate views, whether philosophical or religious. But he does not hold this truth

[1] Since Barth delivered the lectures, the problem of revelation has been examined afresh from the epistemological side by Dr. Richard Kroner. Unlike earlier volumes in the series which assumed a rather simple correlation in the experience of the world between revelation and reason, Professor Kroner is frankly committed to the primacy of revelation and seeks to work out an adequate theory of knowledge on the basis of this fact. This seems to me to be precisely the converse of what has usually been done and to affect theology profoundly. It is the difference between a statement of the Christian faith for which revelation is *also* a source of truth and one for which revelation is the *basis* and the *criterion* of truth.

But it is worth noting too that the changing outlook upon the problem of Christianity and culture has not been understood by the theologians alone. The lectures offered by the distinguished physician, Sir Charles Scott Sherrington bear the significant title: *Man on His Nature* and were delivered in the same year as were those by Karl Barth. Altough Dr. Sherrington does not attempt a positive exposition of the Christian faith, it is notable that he does undertake to set forth the human problem. Perhaps the earlier discussions on this foundation have been too long and too completely concerned with the problem of the world with the result that the urgency of the human problem was overlooked and to that extent the divine nature and the divine activity lost persuasiveness. There were special reasons for this which one cannot wish to ignore. But it is equally important to notice that the fresh preoccupation with the human problem is coupled with a theological analysis at once more dynamic and more deliberately *Christian.*

to be self-evident or self-contained. He regards it frankly as revealed and as imposing upon those who hold this truth the continuing responsibility of relating it relevantly and critically to the surrounding context of thought and life on each new level of expression. Thus, the Christian mind has at long last recovered its self-respect and it is no longer really possible—though it will continue to be done—to think through the problems of modern life without taking thoroughly into account what Christianity has to say. Christianity has, so to speak, taken the offensive in the struggle for the re-construction of culture in a global world. The beginning was made, of course, with the publication of Barth's *Roemerbrief*. But Dr. Niebuhr has put the matter, as Barth has not succeeded in doing, in such a way as to give the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith a more convincing position amidst the intellectual controversies of our time. If Barth may be said to have awakened the Church to its theological heritage and its theological responsibility, Niebuhr may be said to have awakened the secular mind to a new interest in and respect for the theology of the Church. In the third place, *The Nature and Destiny of Man* is the work of an American theologian. In an earlier issue of THE STUDENT WORLD[1], attention was called to the fact that there is a promising renascence of theological thought in the United States which is particularly heartening in view of the current concern of the Church around the world to come to a common mind about its faith and duty. The second volume of Dr. Niebuhr's work was not then available. But its appearance has amply confirmed the judgment then expressed that his Gifford lectures were certain to be a landmark in the history of Christian thought in America. Not since Edwards and Bushnell have true piety and sound learning been joined in so ripe an expression of the timeless wisdom of the Church's faith and the peculiarly American sense for what is vital and indispensable in the immediate and the concrete. The fact that as a professor of Applied Christianity in a distinguished American Seminary, Reinhold Niebuhr should have given to the Christian Church a theological work of first rank and timeliness is significant proof that America has come of age theologically and is drawing in its own way but with a sure grasp upon the perennial insights of the Christian faith for the emboldening of the Church's witness to the truth and the life in a disintegrating world.

Christianity and Culture

The Nature and Destiny of Man is a theological work of first rank and timeliness because it defines the relevance of the Christian faith to contemporary culture. "The belief which informs these

[1]Cf. the article by the present writer entitled, "The Promise of Theology in America," First Quarter, 1942.

pages," we are told in the Preface to the second volume, "is that the Christian faith represents deeper sources of insight into the meaning of life and, therefore, also greater sources of power for the fulfilment of life than has been assumed in the main currents of modern culture." These sources of insight and power are supplied, according to Niebuhr, by the Christian doctrine of the Atonement. The disintegration of modern culture, on the other hand, is due chiefly to its failure to understand the problem of human nature and human history in sufficient depth and complexity. Human nature is history-conscious and history-making. And when this fact is displaced from its strategic position at the center of the problem of meaning, it becomes impossible in the long run to achieve the unity and stability essential to sustain culture. At the same time, Professor Niebuhr absolves the modern mind from sole responsibility for having ignored the wisdom of the Christian faith. He recognises with compelling candor that the Church has made its own mistakes with reference to the understanding and the articulation of the truth delivered unto it from the beginning. The Church has also failed adequately to comprehend the nature of man and of his destiny and in addition has not infrequently failed to order its thought and life in accordance with the limitations imposed upon the pride of truth and power by the doctrine of the Atonement itself. Therefore, far from abandoning the cultural problem to the errors and sins of modern man, Professor Niebuhr's firm conviction that the Church is in possession of the final truth about life leads him out of contrition for the errors and sins of the Church to a fresh application of the principle of toleration in the attempt to close the widening gap between Christianity and culture and so to arrest the spiritual disintegration of our time.

Man has the capacity to make history because he occupies and is aware of a paradoxical position in the world. On the one hand, man is involved in the finitude and flux of nature. On the other, man is possessed of the capacity of freedom to transcend nature and to make everything in it, including himself, the object of his reflection, desire, and concern. "As a creature who is involved in flux but who is also conscious of the fact that he is so involved, he cannot be totally involved. A spirit who can set time, nature, the world and being *per se* in juxtaposition to himself and inquire after the meaning of these things, proves that in some sense he stands outside and beyond them. . . . The only principle for the comprehension of the whole (the whole which includes both himself and his world) is therefore inevitably beyond his comprehension. Man is thus in the position of being unable to comprehend himself in his full stature of freedom without a principle of comprehension which is beyond his comprehension." (I, 124-25.) This principle of comprehension is supplied by the revelation of the nature and activity of God

contained in the Bible. "In a religion of revelation, the unveiling of the eternal purpose and will, underlying the flux and evanescence of the world, is expected; and the expectation is fulfilled in personal and social-historical experience." (I, 126.) In Dr. Niebhur's judgment this kind of expectation and this kind of fulfiment are evident in biblical faith alone.

The biblical view of human nature

Contemporary culture, however, has lost its understanding of the paradoxical character of human nature. Consequently, the facts of history have been increasingly at variance with prevailing views of the possibilities of history. The first of the two volumes of this work is devoted to an analysis of this misunderstanding and confusion about the position of man in the world and to an exposition of the biblical view of man as creature and sinner which the author offers as a more satisfactory basis for appraising the course of human history. Briefly, the argument is that modern anthropology has tended continually toward a naturalistic subordination of man at the expense of his freedom and a rationalistic emancipation of man from his involvement in nature. This fluctuation is really compounded of the classical emphasis upon man's reason as the mark of his uniqueness, and the emphasis of the Renaissance upon man's discrete individuality as the mark of his uniqueness. The concern of the Renaissance for individuality, however, could only have arisen under the influence of Christianity since classical thought was too absorbed by the distinction between the temporal and the eternal to give significance to human individuality. On the other hand, "according to Christian faith each individual life is subjected to the will of God. It is this obedience to the divine will which establishes the right relation between the human will in its finiteness and the whole world order as ruled by God." (I, 58.) In two brilliant introductory chapters, Professor Niebuhr shows how the inability of modern man to solve on the one hand the problems of vitality (the characteristic expression of, though not identical with, man's involvement in nature) and form (the characteristic expression of, though not identical with, man's freedom to transcend nature), and on the other hand, the problem of individuality, springs from the inadequate appraisal of man's paradoxical position in the world.

The Bible, however, does take proper account of human finitude and freedom. Its doctrine of man as created in the image of God emphasises both man's involvement in the natural order and the height of man's self-transcendence. Its doctrine of sin ascribes man's insecurity and anxiety in the world to a defection of man himself and not to his unique position in the world. "The uniqueness of the biblical approach to the human problem lies in its subor-

dination of the problem of finiteness to the problem of sin. It is not the contradiction of finiteness and freedom from which biblical religion seeks emancipation. It seeks redemption from sin; and the sin from which it seeks redemption is occasioned, though not caused, by this contradiction in which man stands." (I, 178). Indeed, the depth and correctness of biblical wisdom at this point are expressed by the consistency with which the Bible maintains that sin cannot be excused by or derived from any other element in the human situation while at the same time insisting that man does not sin out of sheer perversity. Niebuhr finds the mystery of sin precisely in the vicious circularity between the anxiety nourished by man's contradictory position in the world and the pride which prompts man ever and again to a rebellious overreaching of the limits of his true condition. He adopts the dictum of Kierkegaard that "sin posits itself" as most faithfully interpreting the mystery of sin both with respect to its occasion and its elements (pride and sensuality, dishonesty and the will-to-power) and as tipping the balance of truth in the long controversy of the Christian ages between the Augustinians and the Pelagians in favour of the former.

However, the most important aspect of Niebuhr's analysis of the elements of the biblical view of human nature is his emphatic rejection of total depravity. He holds that this conception is without biblical foundation and is a theological liability. Those who hold to this doctrine have no way of explaining the *creative* as well as the destructive aspect of anxiety which enables man to reach out for as well as receive the truth about himself and his salvation expressed in biblical revelation. The doctrine of total depravity, moreover, makes for a too unqualified negation of the immediate cultural possibilities and responsibilities and thus drives too deep a wedge between Christianity and culture. And then, this doctrine misunderstands the true connection between man's essential nature and his sinful state without which the human problem cannot be completely and ultimately appraised. Niebuhr effectively disposes of the dilemma which has long attended Christian theology as it found itself suspended between a rationalistic rejection of the myth of "the Fall" and a literalistic-historical defence of it. He finds, however, in the myth the clue to the problem of his book. The myth does not record, according to Niebuhr, any sinless act of Adam but only tells of Adam acting sinfully. There is, therefore, a "perfection before the Fall" which is a "perfection before the act" (I, 278) and which corresponds to the highest reaches of man's awareness of his finitude and freedom which denote essential human nature. In the broadest sense, this awareness can be defined by the term "conscience" for the sense of "the ought", of the "law" is the way in which the original perfection of man is experienced by sinful man. Whenever the self after an action takes up a position outside that action and judges it as sin,

it enters a moment of self-transcendence which Niebuhr designates as the "locus of original righteousness". "The original righteousness of man stands, as it were, outside of history. Yet it is in the man who is in history, and when sin comes it actually borrows from this original righteousness." (I, 280). This transcendent character of original righteousness which is attested by the ultimate tension within the self between its essential nature and its "fallen" behaviour is, in Niebuhr's view, profoundly understood by Pauline thought alone. All simpler explanations of human nature which reduce the stature of man to the level of his involvement in process or extend it in disregard of this involvement and which distort the virtue of man by a too pessimistic or a too optimistic appraisal of his possibilities and achievements in the world are to be rejected because they are at once unbiblical and unhistorical, or, what amounts to the same thing, untrue.

The Atonement and history

The problem of human destiny is inseparable from the problem of human nature. This is so because it is due to human finitude and freedom that history is possible and that history is made. It is so also because oversimplified anthropologies have given rise to false expectations as to what is possible in history and to erroneous views of the significance of history. As Niebuhr puts it the critical question is whether the original perfection which continues to express itself in the sense of responsibility of sinful men can ever be completely realised within history. It is this question to which he devotes the second volume of the lectures, considering in turn the relation between the biblical doctrine of the Atonement and the meaningfulness of history; the strengths and the weaknesses in the interpretation of the Atonement in medieval, renaissance, and reformation Christianity; the cultural problems which require the Christian faith for their solution and towards which Christianity has a positive responsibility; and the resolution of the total problem of history in terms of the Christian symbols of the end of history.

Cultures and religions can be significantly distinguished, according to Niebuhr, by their attitudes toward history. There are some which cannot give significance to history because they regard the problem of human finitude as the basic problem of life and look for the final triumph of human freedom in an eternity of self-transcendence which completely negates and abandons the temporal order. On the other hand, there are cultures and religions from which "the problem of sin rather than finiteness is . . . the basic problem of life" (II, 3). In such instances, what occurs in, and what is remembered and recorded about, the temporal order contributes at least partially to the meaningfulness of life although it is recognised that the full meaning of history and the fulfilment of history (i.e. "the power

to fulfil the meaning" of history) must be disclosed from beyond. This expectation of the disclosure and the fulfilment of the meaning of history from beyond history is, in Niebuhr's view, the root and the heart of prophetic-messianism. "The basic distinction between historical and non-historical religions and cultures may thus be succinctly defined as the difference between those which expect and those which do not expect a Christ" (II, 4). It is scarcely necessary to mention that Taoism, Buddhism, Hinduism and Hellenism are ranged on the negative side of the messianic line whereas Zoroastrianism, Judaism, and fragmentary aspects even of Roman and Egyptian religion are ranged on the positive side. It is worth doing, however, because Niebuhr's distinction effectively cuts the ground from under the widespread tendency of the modern mind to regard all religions as equally significant or equally relevant and of Christian thinkers to rest the case for the uniqueness of Christianity upon its inherent reasonableness or excellence. What Niebuhr shows is that the uniqueness of Christianity is established by its own history as an expression of and answer to the basic problem of history which is the messianic problem. He recognises that such a statement of the problem already assumes the answer in the framing of the question since it is impossible "to interpret cultures according to their expectation or want of expectation of a Christ without drawing upon the faith that *the* Christ has been revealed" (II, 5). Moreover, this kind of circularity is the inevitable accompaniment of the meaningful correlation of logic and life. And there is no better proof of the fateful consequence of the attempt to avoid this circularity than the confusion which has ever and again overtaken the Christian mind about its faith when theology has yielded to the temptation of the more logical Hellenic as against the more historical Hebraic interpretation of the meaning of life. The Christian theologian ought never to forget—at the peril of his own task and obligation—Niebuhr's penetrating and decisive observation that "Christ was not expected among the Greeks either because it was thought impossible for God to reveal Himself in history (since history was regarded as no more than temporal succession and natural sequence); or because it was thought unnecessary (since each man's reason was each man's Christ)" (II, 58).

Now contrary to the widely held view that what distinguishes the messianism of the Hebrew prophets from other forms is the universal and ethical character of the prophetic message (as against egoistic and nationalistic particularism), Niebuhr maintains that the uniqueness of Hebraic prophetism is to be found in its discernment of the profoundest problem of human history. That problem "is presented by the prophetic recognition that all history is involved in a perennial defiance of the law of God" (II, 29). Consequently the prophets understood that the meaning of history could

not be disclosed and fulfilled except as an act of divine judgment. But they understood too that neither a recurrent nor a final act of judgment could solve the problem of history except by destroying it. They looked, therefore, toward a resource of divine mercy in terms of which history could be both judged and redeemed. But prohetism was never certain "how the divine mercy is related to the divine wrath and how the perplexity of a total history standing in defiance of God would be resolved" (II, 33). Or, to put it another way, the prophets did not see how the final triumph of good over evil was to be assured in view of the persistence of evil on every level of the good.

It is at this point that the unique historical significance of Christianity appears. The life and teaching of Jesus provide the answer to the prophetic problem and in so doing resolve the problem of history as well. The life of Jesus is informed primarily by the Isaianic conception of the "suffering servant" and the apocalyptic conception of the "son of man" and the death of Jesus is the inevitable and perfect expression of the synthesis of the two. The death of Jesus means that suffering love is not a simple possibility of history but a transcendent act of God which overcomes the evil in history not at the end of history, and not beyond history, but within history. God takes the sins of the world upon and into Himself. Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom of God involves a fundamental reinterpretation of the relation between the possibilities of history and the end of history. In effect, Jesus separates the disclosure of the meaning of history from the fulfilment of history which prophetism had never done. Consequently, all history becomes an *interim* between the disclosure and the fulfilment of its meaning. "Sin is overcome in principle but not in fact. . . . Love must continue to be suffering love rather than triumphant love. . . . History has the quality . . . of partly knowing its true meaning." (II, 49, 51.) The Cross of Christ, therefore, does justice to all the complexities of human nature and human destiny because it resolves the paradox in the nature and activity of God between the divine wrath and mercy and at the same time resolves the paradox in the nature of man between human finitude and freedom by affirming both the possibilities and the limits of history in a transcendent act of disclosure and deliverance.

Under the influence of the Apostle Paul, this significance of the Cross of Christ was elaborated and bequeathed to the course of Christian thought. The crucial passage is I Corinthians 1: 23-24, wherein Christ Crucified is defined as the "wisdom of God and the power of God". Paul rightly understood that "the Atonement is the significant content of the Incarnation" (II, 55). But Paul's successors in the history of Christian thought have continually imperilled the central doctrine of the New Testament by an over-

stress upon one or another of its elements or, more particularly, upon the way in which the final truth expressed in the Atonement is related to the proximate historical truths which are also made significant by the Atonement. Hellenic Christianity has inclined toward a stress upon the "wisdom of God" so that the Atonement becomes rather more a disclosure of the eternal in history than of the act by which God's mercy and justice have been reconciled in the deliverance of history. In such instances the Atonement tends to be subordinated to the Incarnation. But the great division in the mind of the Church centers around the "power of God" expressed in the Atonement. What is the relation between the overcoming of sin *in principle* and the persistence of sin *in fact*? What is the relation between "the quality of partly knowing its true meaning" which belongs to history and the fulfilment of history from beyond itself? These distinctions really point the way to Niebuhr's interpretation of Christian thought and define his own answer to the question of the relevance of Christianity to the confusion about human nature and human destiny which informs contemporary culture.

The Meaning of Grace

We must content ourselves here with the case which Niebuhr makes for the important constructive recommendation of his work. The cardinal error of Christian theology with respect to the power of God expressed in the Atonement is the persistent ambiguity about the relation between the power of God over sin and the power of God in those in whom sin has been overcome "in principle" though not "in fact". Consequently, the truth about history which is revealed and comprehended in the Christian faith has always failed of proper exposition and application in the Church's witness to that faith. Christ crucified, the wisdom of God and the power of God, has never really come into His own as the *truth* because the Church has been divided about *grace*. Grace is the power of God over sin and the power of God in those in whom sin has been overcome "in principle" though not "in fact". The former has been defined theologically as forgiveness or justification. The latter has been defined theologically as holiness or sanctification. Catholic theology has tended in the main to subordinate justification to sanctification with the result that it has too unqualifiedly identified the truth of the Atonement with its own institutional and sacramental dispensation of grace and thereby succumbed to the sin of pride. Catholicism forgets that the limits of history prevent any single possibility of history from expressing the final truth about history within history itself. It forgets that sin has been overcome "in principle" but not "in fact". Reformation theology, on the other hand, has tended in the main to subordinate sanctification to justification with the result that it has too unqualifiedly removed the truth of

the Atonement from the partial meanings and achievements of history so that its own proper insight into the transhistorical character of the final truth about life prompts it to disregard its cultural responsibility. Reformation theology forgets that the limits of history do not destroy the possibilities of history so that the final truth about history must bear some relation to history itself. Meanwhile, the Church was beset from within and from without by protests against the oversimplifications of the main stream of its thought and life. The protest from within expressed itself in the sectarian movement in both pietistic-individual and eschatological-radical forms. The protest from without stemmed from the Renaissance. The latter is more secular and less biblical than the former. But common to both Christian sectarianism and Renaissance secularism is the concern for the realisation of truth and goodness in history (they are both "sanctificationist in principle") and the repudiation of the pretension of Catholicism and the fanaticism of the Reformation.

Niebuhr finds in the institutional pretensions of Catholicism in its Roman form an irrevocable expression of the sin of pride. Therefore, he rejects it as unable to make a fruitful contribution to the solution of the two main cultural problems—truth and justice. The Protestant Reformation has discovered the final truth about life and has expressed this insight in its doctrine of justification which recognises that the sin of pride corrupts every level of human life in history and can only be overcome by an act of divine mercy beyond history. The Renaissance, however, expresses "the impulse towards the fulfilment of life in history" (II, 160) more properly than the Reformation and with a less unmitigated pride than Catholicism. Therefore, Niebuhr proposes with the help of the principle of toleration as expressed within the Christian tradition by the sectarian movement a reopening of the debate between the Reformation and the Renaissance in order that the relevance of the Christian faith to the cultural struggle for truth and justice may be established. It will then be apparent, he thinks, that the Christian symbols of the end of history (Parousia, Last Judgment, Resurrection, Anti-Christ) envisage more profoundly and more completely the total problem of human nature and human destiny than alternate interpretations. And "by its confidence in an eternal ground of existence which is, nevertheless, involved in man's historical striving to the very point of suffering with and for him, this faith can prompt men to accept their historical responsibilities gladly. . . . Our most reliable understanding is the fruit of 'grace' in which faith completes our ignorance without pretending to possess its certainties as knowledge; and in which contrition mitigates our pride without destroying our hope." (II, 321).

The earthly city and the City of God

Professor Niebuhr has wrought a work of brilliance both as regards the depth of its insights and the range of its perspective. No one who is sensitive of the theological and cultural issues and responsibilities of these days can fail to give these two volumes most grateful and careful study. Nor can one, as one reads, fail to recall another epoch-making moment in the Church's thought and life when it was given to one of its most distinguished thinkers and statesmen also to write profoundly and comprehensively about the nature and destiny of man. Then, too, it was made plain that the clue to history could be derived from biblical faith alone and the truth of the Bible was dialectically expounded so as to bring the possibilities of history and the promises beyond history into inseparable and living inter-relation. And the disintegration of the earthly city actually was transformed by a foundation and direction derived from the city of God.

Now Augustine's problem is Niebuhr's problem too. The great merit of these volumes is, on the one hand, the candor and forthrightness with which the author has addressed himself to his problem, and on the other, the striking proposal he has made for altering the terms of the theological discussion of our time. Even those who will wish to dissent at various points from Niebuhr's analysis of culture cannot, in good faith, challenge its integrity and competence. It is perhaps not without significance that secular thinkers in not a few instances have been awakened to a new respect for the Christian mind and have been more open toward the issues Niebuhr has raised than theologians, whose own grasp of the independence and the depth of Christian truth has been weakened by too complete an absorption with the intellectual and social problems of contemporary culture. But the critical issue of these lectures is whether the Reformation insight into the final truth about life and the insight of the Renaissance into the necessity and validity of the pursuit of proximate truth and goodness in life can be effectively combined in a vital and continuing orientation of the Christian faith to culture. If so, then Niebuhr has gone beyond the immediate terms of the contemporary theological problem which is still under the impact of the attack of the dialectical theology upon liberalism, and the Church would be trifling with its own position in the modern world if it failed to follow his lead. If not, then Niebuhr's proposal needs to be examined in terms of a more radical appraisal of the breakdown of the Renaissance and the failure of the Reformation in contemporary culture, and the line between natural and revealed theology which the Barthian movement has inked in red must be more circumspectly regarded.

Frankly, I do not know whether Professor Niebuhr is right or not. I do know, however, that the suggestion which he has made

for the resolution of the problem of human nature and human destiny in terms of the Christian faith requires a complete re-examination of the present theological situation in the Church. With Niebuhr's analysis of the cultural crisis of our time, I am thoroughly in agreement. It also seems to me that he is correct in regarding the problems of revelation and grace as the decisive contemporary theological problems and that he has succeeded in making them culturally relevant. Indeed, those who have for many years been troubled about what they have been pleased to call the excessive pessimism of Niebuhr's thought ought now to be effectively reassured by the constant insistence upon the responsibility for the realisation of the possibilities of truth and justice on every level of life in history. To ask for more is to betray the critic into a plain disregard of the obvious facts of history. All of Niebuhr's strictures against liberalism to the contrary notwithstanding, he has preserved in these volumes every proper claim and hope with respect to the created world for which theological liberalism has contended.

This has been achieved, of course, by returning to the roots of liberalism in the Renaissance and by abandoning the christology of liberalism for one that is more truly Pauline and Protestant (Reformation). Here is a genuine and vital *theologia crucis* which is rightly regarded as central both in the New Testament and in the Reformation. So long as the unrighteousness of the righteous—and not the relation of the eternal to the temporal—remains the central problem of human nature and human destiny, the Atonement—and not the Incarnation—will define the meaning and truth of Christianity. Wherefore, what mainly concerns me about the analysis of these lectures is certain theological and anthropological implications which are drawn from this christology.

The answer of the Christian faith to the problem of the nature and destiny of man is assumed, according to Niebuhr, in his analysis of the cultural problem. But this assumption does not govern either his treatment of revelation or grace. We are told that revelation is necessarily both private (general) and historical (special). Without the first, there would be no way of apprehending the second; and contrariwise, without the second, the first would be capriciously directed and defined. In experience, moreover, the evidence for private revelation is man's sense of reverence for majesty and of moral obligation. But the longing for forgiveness is ambiguous as private revelation yet clearly established when regarded as historical. Now the fact and the evidence of private revelation are derived by Niebuhr from creation, whereas the fact and the evidence of historical revelation are primarily christological. But if creation and redemption are linked in this way as revelation it is not clear how or why the answer to the human problem should be assumed in the analysis. For either the possibilities of history are *possibilities*

because they are integral to the structure of history so that an analysis of them is possible without revelation, though such an analysis may point the way toward revelation, or creation and redemption are both to be understood with reference to an act of revelation which stands in juxtaposition to, and is not simply an extension or correction of, the structure of history. When Niebuhr declares that it is only possible to understand the expectation of a Christ in history in so far as *the* Christ has appeared in history, he seems to recognise the independence of the revelatory act. But if the sense for majesty and obligation are integral to human nature, it is difficult to see why experience does not validate a sense for forgiveness and a sense for the messiah as well.

Remaining ambiguities

This ambiguity in Niebuhr's doctrine of revelation is accompanied by an analogous ambiguity in his doctrine of grace. The critical problem is how to relate grace as the power of God over sin (justification) to grace as the power of God in man as forgiven (sanctification). But it is a very real question whether the Renaissance which has eliminated the idea of grace altogether from its devotion to the possibilities of history could be more open to the insight of the Reformation into justification than Catholicism which has too completely obscured the truth of justification by its own devotion to the possibilities of history. It seems to me that the Renaissance can be said to be "sanctificationist in principle" only in so far as the possibilities of history are regarded *eo ipso* as manifestations of divine grace. In this case, the line between *grace* and *nature* would seem to be as indistinct as the line between *revelation* and *nature* and the principal office of justifying grace would be to correct and complete the light of nature. Justification, in other words, would transmute sanctification from a matter of principle to a matter of fact. But Catholicism, though it has always claimed too strongly that such a transmutation has occurred, has at least never claimed any less. So that Professor Niebuhr's anticipation of a Reformation solution for an essentially Catholic analysis is unlikely to be realised by the simple disavowal of the benefit of clergy. The Renaissance does express the possibilities of history without the benefit of clergy. But the Reformation was as adamant against such an abrogation of grace as it was against the papal usurpation of it.

The Reformers knew that the possibilities of history lead more readily to idolatry than they do to the truth of God revealed in Christ. They recognised in this idolatry the perennial resistance of history to the gospel. And it is just possible that despite all the excesses in their statement of the doctrine of total depravity, that they intended to define by it the limits of this idolatry as the negative presupposition for a theology of the Cross. In such a theology, the

redemption of the world is conceived as an attack upon the world. The power of the gospel so conceived lies in the recognition that sin has been overcome not only "in principle" but "in fact" as well. And the wisdom of the gospel so conceived lies in the recognition that it is the miracle of grace which gives to the possibilities of history their truth and power so long as history endures. Niebuhr rightly sees that the mistake of the Reformation lay not in the direction but in the relevance of its attack. But his conviction that the contemporary revival of the direction of the Reformation has repeated its mistake leads him to regard a friend as an enemy and to leave one wondering whether the Renaissance has not triumphed over the Reformation once again. Certainly the Reformation divided against itself cannot stand. But this is the crisis of the Christian faith and contemporary culture. Dr. Niebuhr has done a great work for both by defining and facing the issue.

PAUL LEHMANN.

A Faith for Education

(*The important book by our former associate, reviewed below, is one which all who are interested in the future of university education should read. We have asked Arnold Nash, who wrote in* THE STUDENT WORLD, *First Quarter, 1943, on* A Faith for the University *to review it. A volume by Mr. Nash, entitled* The University and the Modern World *will be published in October, and we are asking Dr. Kotschnig to perform the same service. This is one of the most important issues before the W.S.C.F. today. Ed.*)

SLAVES NEED NO LEADERS: An Answer to the Fascist Challenge to Education. By Walter M. Kotschnig. *Oxford University Press.* 1943. $2.75.

That this book is of first rate importance cannot be denied; any product of the pen of the author of *Unemployment in the Learned Professions* and the editor of *The University in a Changing World* demands the attention of all who desire seriously to keep up to date with the mutual impact of education and the tensions of our international society. Part I describes in lucid yet detailed style what has been happening in the Western world within the different educational systems. The author's description of the Fascist attack on the schools and universities of continental Europe over the last decade is a masterpiece of condensation and skill.

The author is not so happy in dealing with England. I hold no

brief for the English "public" school system nor the appeasement policy of Mr. Neville Chamberlain—the case against them is damning enough in all conscience—but to see them as related (p. 13) is grotesque. No professional group in Great Britain recruited before the present war such a high proportion of its personnel, as did the Foreign Office, from Eton, Harrow, Winchester, and the like and yet nowhere was there such a bitter antagonism to the policy of appeasement. It is more than grotesque, it is unjust to link the name of Chamberlain with that of Laval (p. 217) in their attitude towards collective security; would that Chamberlain had been not the "ignorant and self-willed old man"[1] that he was but "the clever devil" of the theories of the left wing intelligentsia of Britain and America!

In the pages of THE STUDENT WORLD it is not on political criticisms that we would dwell. There is a more fundamental issue, the treatment of which in Part II, *Reconstruction,* provoked in the mind of at least one reader what can only be called a state of alarm.

Dr. Kotschnig is not a professor whose scholarship has blinded his insights. His comments on the credulity of the cynic (p. 9) are a joy to read. His awareness that the democratic system of education in the Anglo-Saxon world has led to an anarchy of values (p. 60) should be communicated to all his fellow professors of education. His penetrating criticisms of the prevalent philosophy of education in the U.S.A., which has its origins in John Dewey (p. 144), does not mean that for Dr. Kotschnig education must not be related to living experience; indeed the picture which he draws of French and Belgian children being received into hospitable Switzerland (p. 274) could only be drawn by a pen moved by a deep sympathy in the original Greek meaning of that much abused noun.

Yet—in spite of (or rather, because of) all these qualities of heart and mind in the author—one puts the book down with alarm. The underlying philosophy of education is that of the "positive neutrality" of International Student Service and that, like patriotism, is in this tortured world, not enough. Let me make it clear that I have nothing but admiration for all the relief work which the I.S.S. has done, is doing, and will, under God, still continue to do. Let me state that the personal debt which I owe to the I.S.S. for making it possible for me to receive the first glimmerings of an understanding that the university student belongs to an international community when it sent its General Secretary, now Prof. Walter Kotschnig, to tour the British universities in 1926. I have with me still the notes of a speech which he made in the University of

[1]Not my phrase; it was the verdict of a member of the British Foreign Office—incidentally a product of Eton and Balliol—from whom I sought a private opinion after Munich on the wisdom of appeasement.

Liverpool. His closing words I shall never forget. "You can never build a world community on *understanding* alone; something more is necessary. It can only be the mutual force of Christian love."

Yet to express a debt is not to ignore what in these crucial days is the great need of the educational world of today. It is for an adequate frame of reference. Dr. Kotschnig sees this with perfect clarity (p. 148). He recognises that it means that the "spiritual element cannot be neglected" (p. 202). But what is the frame of reference—in short *the faith*—that he leaves us with? It is one which allows him to refer to Bertrand Russell (p. 254) as an "authority" in the sphere of education, which allows him to quote H. G. Wells (p. 272) with such approval on the relation between spirit and organisation, and which allows him to rely on "men of good will and intelligence throughout the world" (p. 270), not on "bureaucrats, but . . . men of experience and vision and (shades of the English public school! A.S.N.) character" (p. 264). In short it is the faith on which the modern world, now going to its doom or salvation, has been built. It is the faith in man as fundamentally decent and well intentioned with a reason which is unsullied by selfishness. Well indeed may Dr. Kotschnig refer with such approval so often to Sir Richard Livingstone's hope for and trust in "human beings in the Greek meaning" (e.g., p. 231 and p. 248). The frame of reference in terms of which this book has its ultimate meaning is Greece and not Palestine, whereas the book we want from Dr. Kotschnig is one which begins with the premise "to the Greeks, foolishness".

Slaves Need No Leaders was inspired by Dr. Kotschnig's close association with the Division of Intercourse and Education of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. May his fellowship in the World's Student Christian Federation inspire—or provoke—him to write another book with the Pauline title *Slaves unto Christ —A Christian Answer to the Secular Challenge.*

A. S. N.

The New Bible Study

THE UNITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Archibald M. Hunter, B.D., Ph.D., D.Phil.

PREFACE TO BIBLE STUDY. By Alan Richardson, B.D.
Both 5/- net. *Student Christian Movement Press, London.*

These two volumes are a notable addition to the long line of books on Bible study, which have been published through the years by the S.C.M. Press, and we hope that they will be as widely read as many of their predecessors. They make excellent companions to Suzanne de Dietrich's *Rediscovering the Bible,* and we should like to see them on the working bookshelf of every S.C.M. secretary, or student pastor, who can use the English language.

The aim in both cases is the same, namely to set forth and emphasise the *unity* of the Bible. Professor Hunter does this superbly for the New Testament, and naturally throws the reader back to the Old. Canon Richardson, for so we must now style our friend lately study secretary of the British S.C.M., introduces the reader to Bible study by the method of showing him what the Bible as a whole is about. This approach is excellent, for too many students do a scrappy piece of Bible study (if they do any at all), and are little the wiser, because it does not relate to anything else they know about the Bible. It reminds one of those miserable passages for language study, torn from their context in the works of an author whom the student neither reads or understands. Such fragmentary Bible study has the further absurdity of seldom holding the student's attention until he has reached the point. These books should work against such sorry failures, and should stimulate such interest in Bible study that the student will find himself started on an adventure, which does not end with the end of term, or even with graduation.

Both books are in the "biblical theology" tradition, and that is as it should be, for the whole outlook on the Bible is once again being renewed for a fortunate generation. (We do not forget what the late Dr. T. R. Glover's *Jesus of History* did for another generation.) Professor Hunter shows us with great skill, in the small compass at his disposal, how the books of the New Testament are all primarily concerned with the one Gospel. A careful looking up of his references, and following out of his suggestions, makes a

fascinating study, which illuminates the Christian faith. What he has to say, for example, about the Atonement is far more helpful, in the light of the argument of the book, than any treatise a student might lay his hands on. He is friendly with his reader, suggestive rather than dogmatic, like a good speaker at a summer conference.

Canon Richardson is more didactic, partly because his purpose is wider, and he is trying to meet particular difficulties in his reader's mind. He is at his best in the middle chapters, where he shows how the Bible hangs together without using those subdivisions and lists of dates, which defeat the memory and in the end confuse the reader. He communicates something of his own biblical enthusiasm, and sends one off on happy voyages of discovery. But his style is a little *ex cathedra,* and the chair is a study chair.

An unanswered question is how to make this new approach to the Bible come alive for people who are not interested in the Bible at all. It *ought* to provide the opportunity we are looking for of reaching the growing proportion of our fellow students who "care for none of these things". But biblical theologians are still so elated by their victory over the liberals, that they are apt to be proud and intimidating! Professor Hunter is an exception and has some fine paragraphs about the preacher making the Gospel his own; he believes in the dangerous but necessary "process of making the primitive Gospel acceptable and relevant to the men of today", but his book is designed to help those who are already within the Christian tradition. Canon Richardson is stern on this point, and says we must learn the Bible's language, or it will be a closed book to us. But how can you bring the horse to the water, let alone make him drink?

The secret perhaps lies in the fact that there are two places where "biblical theology" is being forged today—the one is the college library, and the other is where men face disaster. When our fellow students return from personal experiences of war, from internment, from "occupation", some will come back in a mood of despair, but others with that knowledge of biblical living which will illuminate our study, and put a new weapon of evangelism in our hands. It is for those of us who are left in the free universities today to keep the process of rediscovering going on, and these two books will help us. An S.C.M. branch which has no Bible study is simply betraying its absent members, and the future.

R. C. M.

914

Date Due

266
SW
Rf.
V.36, 1943

18,026